FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 231 2 December 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Vorontsov Holds Press Conference on Test Ban AA 1
Remarks on Moratorium AA 3
Bogachev Lambastes U.S. Violation of SALT II AA 3
Working Session at Geneva Arms Talks Opens 2 Dec [Shishlo] AA 5
Petrosyants Views 3d Round [Dmitriyev] AA 5
STERN Interviews Akhromeyev on Defense [IZVESTIYA 27 Nov] AA 6
Special Envoy Briefs PRC on Arms Talks With U.S. AA 9
Petrovskiy on Need for 'Constructive' Arms Talks AA 9

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Delegate Criticizes U.S. Stance at CSCE CC 1
Report Contrasts East, West [Revyakin] CC 1
Druzhinin Compares Bonn-Pretoria, U.S.-Iran CC 2

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Continuing Coverage of U.S. Iran Arms Sales A 1
Reagan Meets With Commission [Fedyashin] A 1
Zhukov Commentary A 1
Vasiliyev Criticizes U.S. Campaign Against Syria A 3

CHINA

NPC Economic Delegation Begins Moscow Visit [IZVESTIYA 1 Dec] B 1
Amity Society Conference Held in Moscow 25 Nov B 1
Institute of USA, Canada Delegation Visits PRC B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Reportage on Roundtable Conference in Japan C 1
Ryzhkov Message C 1
Voss-Led Delegation Arrives C 1
Talks Open C 1
Meeting With Politicians C 2
U.S. Deploying 'New Class' of Arms in Korea [PRAVDA 29 Nov] C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Gorbachev, Gandhi Hold Joint News Conference D 1
Moscow TV Version D 1
PRAVDA Version [30 Nov] D 10
Delhi TV Version D 20
Gorbachev Meets With Indian President Singh D 31
Gorbachev, Delegation Depart Delhi 28 Nov D 31
Officials Greet Gorbachev on Return From India D 32

EASTERN EUROPE

PRAVDA Comments on Albanian Development, Policies F 1
["Observer" in 29 Nov]
IZVESTIYA Reports Honecker-Nikonov Meeting [28 Nov] F 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Claims of Nerve Gas Supplied to Libya Denied H 1
[Pilyatskin in IZVESTIYA 27 Nov]
Democratic Yemen's Al-'Attas Cabled on Reelection H 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Demichev, Others Attend RSFSR Conference R 1
Reportage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session R 1
Opening, Agenda R 1
Morning Session Speakers R 2
Moscow Notes Work on RSFSR Legal Code Completed R 2
Slyunkov Gives Report at Belorussian Plenum R 3
Scherbitskiy Urges 'War' Against Incompetence R 3
Ukrainian CP CC Examines Draft Plan, Budget R 4
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 25 Nov]
Yeltsin Addresses Moscow Restructuring Seminar R 5
[Muladzhanov in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Nov]
Finnish Paper Cites Yevtushenko on Culture R 5
[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 25 Nov]

VORONTSOV HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE ON TEST BAN

LD021043 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0905 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow, 2 Dec (TASS) -- USSR first deputy foreign minister Yuliy Vorontsov has spoken at a press conference which took place here today. He said:

The complete ending of all nuclear tests -- and we remain convinced of this -- is a most important immediate measure and the shortest route leading to a reduction in nuclear arms and their subsequent elimination.

It is not fortuitous, therefore, that this measure formed an integral part of the proposals which were put forward by the Soviet side at the Reykjavik meeting. This conviction of ours was confirmed again in the Delhi Declaration, signed during the recent visit to India by Mikhail Gorbachev: among specific and urgent measures aimed at disarmament it clearly mentions "a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests."

As is known, because of the stance of the U.S. side on the question of maintenance of the ABM treaty, there was, unfortunately, no success in Reykjavik in attaining final accords on any of the topics discussed there. But, as in the questions of strategic offensive weapons and medium-range missiles, the sides were close to reaching an understanding on the question of tests, too. In particular, President Reagan voiced assent to "the United States and the Soviet Union beginning talks, the objective of which is the complete cessation of nuclear tests."

However, on the question of tests, too, the U.S. side is now disowning the Reykjavik accords, evidence of this being all the subsequent statements of Administration spokesmen and the third round of the Soviet-U.S. talks that has ended in Geneva. Even in naming these talks the U.S. side refuses to include the word "halt", proposing to discuss merely the tests themselves.

What do we see as the reason for such a stance? Above all, of course, not in the issue of verification [kontrol]. For many years, perhaps even decades now, we have constantly been told: once there is satisfactory verification [kontrol] there will be an agreement on the banning of tests. Even in Reykjavik, evidently through force of habit, President Reagan again spoke of the need for reliable verification [kontrol].

But this was obviously said in a mechanical fashion. There is no longer any problem as regards verification [kontrol] of a halt to nuclear tests. After all in the past year alone our side has made in this sphere so many proposals removing any worry there might have been as regards verification [kontrol] that there would be enough of them for several agreements.

I would like to recall in this connection some of the Soviet Union's proposals. On 15 January 1986 Mikhail Gorbachev said that if the United States agrees to a halt to nuclear explosions on a mutual basis the necessary verification [kontrol] of the observance of a moratorium would be fully ensured by national technical means and also with the help of international procedures, and where necessary by on-site inspection.

On 24 August 1986, replying to another message of the "Delhi Six", Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the readiness of the Soviet side to send its experts to the meeting on verification [kontrol] issues proposed by "The Six" between experts of "The Six" and experts of the USSR and the United States. We agreed to also take up the proposal of the six countries on giving assistance in verifying [proverka] the halting of nuclear tests, including on-site inspection [inspektsiya na mestakh].

In accordance with an agreement between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Natural Resources Defense Council, dated 28 May 1986, U.S. scientists have set up seismological equipment in the area of Semipalatinsk to check the nonconduct of nuclear explosions by the Soviet Union. What is more, in answers given to RUDE PRAVO on 9 September of this year Mikhail Gorbachev suggested that this accord between scientists should be turned into an official agreement.

He then suggested to President Reagan that thought should be given to the possibility of creating an international supra-national network to verify [kontrol] the halting of tests.

At the disarmament confrence of 22 July 1986 we proposed beginning the development [razrabotka] of a system for prompt transmission of second-level seismic data using seismic stations united into a global network. At the same time we suggested that an international experiment on exchanging such data be conducted in 1988.

However, the U.S. reaction to all these constructive steps from the USSR as well as to the numerous proposals of the "Delhi Six" and to the recommendations of the Nonaligned Movement conference in Harare only too clearly attests that in reality it is not at all a matter of verification [kontrol].

In our dealings with the present U.S. Administration we have already seen for ourselves on more than one occasion that when their own position on some issue begins to hamper them, they change it as easily as they would a pair of gloves. For this has become their favorite trick in politics. One things is said but ultimately something entirely different is done. This is also relevant to the question of tests. When the argument about the inadequacy of verification [kontrol] collapsed, it became quite clear to everyone that the "emperor has lost his clothes": The United States simply doesn't want to end testing.

The reason for the U.S. side's refusal to agree to the ending of tests lies in the fact that the United States is openly banking on obtaining military superiority over the USSR by the creation [sozdaniye] of third-generation nuclear weapons. During the nuclear tests which are being carried out at the present time in the United States it is not just new nuclear warheads that are being developed [razrabatyvatsya] but space-based strike armaments that are also being created [sozdavatsya] in accordance with the SDI program.

Taking the arms race to new frontiers, Washington is now stating directly that nuclear explosions have to resound on Earth until such time as nuclear weapons are eliminated. The fact that problems of verification [kontrol] have been merely an excuse has once again been confirmed by the Soviet-U.S. talks, the third round of which has just ended.

The Soviet Union has done everything incumbent upon it in order to break the deadlock of the problem of the complete banning of nuclear tests. Unfortunately the United States did not respond to the calls for it to join in the moratorium which we introduced and extended four times.

But we do not intend to give up the struggle for a complete ending of nuclear tests and we will continue vigorously to secure the achievement of this together with all those who are struggling for the nobie aim of a nonviolent world free of nuclear weapons.

Remarks on Moratorium

LD021120 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 2 TASS -- The Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions will be in effect till January 1, 1987, Yuliy Vorontsov, a first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said in reply to questions at a press conference here today. He noted that the U.S. leadership still had time to join that moratorium.

The Soviet Union's stand on nuclear testing will depend on the actions of the USA, Vorontsov said. Since the Soviet Union introduced its moratorium, the USA has carried out 23 nuclear weapon tests. Most of them were related to the development of third-generation weapons rather than intended to check the safety of existing nuclear munitions. Seeking to break away from the Soviet Union and achieve one-sided military superiority, the USA is energetically working to develop nuclear weapons for "Star Wars."

In this situation, Vorontsov said, the endless extension of the unilateral moratorium would imperil the security of the USSR and its allies.

The problem of nuclear testing is inseparable from the U.S. attempts to develop weapons of new types. That is why it was included in the package of proposals made by the USSR in Reykjavik. The linkage of those problems is not at all far-fetched or artificial because the SDI programme envisions continued nuclear testing, Vorontsov said.

BOGACHEV LAMBASTES U.S. VIOLATION OF SALT II

LD011832 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Moscow December 1 TASS -- by TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev

On November 28, 1986, the United States exceeded quantitative limits set by the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty SALT-2, by phasing in a 131st B-52 strategic bomber.

Washington violated individual provisions of this treaty also earlier, in particular, when it began to develop two men intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Midgetman and the MX, which is prohibited by SALT-2 in no uncertain terms, and when it ignores its commitments under this treaty not to provide any deliberate camouflage for strategic systems.

But the latest case of the United States overstepping the limit on the total number of strategic MIRVed missiles and long-range bombers with cruise missiles is of a qualitivately new, political nature.

First, unlike the previous violations which the Pentagon either simply concealed or justified with casuistic interpretations of the treaty, the United States now has openly admitted the deployment of the "above-limit" bomber with cruise missiles.

Second, Washington has presented the violation as the U.S. ultimate renunciation of SALT-2.

A group of American senators, including Paul Laxalt, Strom Thurmond and Jesse Helms, asserted once that the existing arms control treaties and the process of talks only undermined the security of America and the "free world".

Washington's decision to brush aside the SALT-2 treaty marks victory for certain U.S. forces that look at the world through the cross-hairs of a sighting device.

The developments of recent weeks in the field of arms limitation and reduction show that Washington has responded by taking a step back to each Soviet attempt to move forward to accommodate the U.S. position and make it easier to look for mutually acceptable solutions.

It is in this way Washington has reacted to the Soviet Union's constructive proposals both for destroying the two countries' medium-range missiles in Europe and for their drastic cuts on a global scale.

The United States has beaten back from its own previous positions also in the issue of first reducing all strategic arms and then eliminating them completely.

The impression is that the White House is afraid of the very prospect of the sides' positions on the problems of war and peace getting closer.

The U.S. renunciation of SALT-2 is another step the present U.S. Administration has taken towards a "final solution" to the problem of limiting and reducing arms by destroying the corresponding agreements signed before President Reagan moved into the White House.

The Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty of 1979 has been a result of the sides' reasonable compromise. It cannot be called ideal. From the Soviet point of view, the treaty could have been much more effective and comprehensive.

But even in its present form, SALT has been a reliable barrier in the way of the nuclear arms race. This is what has made its principal value.

What has made the U.S. Administration renounce a treaty which has, in the opinion of a vast majority of experts, including American ones, been advantageous to the United States?

The answer apparently is in Washington's desire to have its hands completely free to press on with the arms race.

The White House dislikes SALT for having sealed strategic parity and for hampering its illusory plans to gain military superiority.

By renouncing SALT-2, Washington has taken yet another step along the road of undercutting the very idea of solving international problems through talks.

The consequences of this decision as yet are hard even to predict.

WORKING SESSION AT GENEVA ARMS TALKS OPENS 2 DEC

LD021059 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] Geneva December 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo reports:

At the proposal of the Soviet side a working meeting of representatives of the Soviet and American delegations within the framework of the talks on nuclear and space weapons opened here. The Soviet group at the meeting is led by Ambassador Viktor Karpov, the American group -- by Ambassador Max Kampelman.

It is planned to continue during the meeting the discussion of the questions included in the agenda of the talks on nuclear and space weapons, primarily new far-reaching proposals submitted by the Soviet delegation on November 7 on the basis of agreements reached in Reykjavik. The purpose of the meeting is the preparation of conditions for a fruitful work at the next round of talks on nuclear and space weapons due to be held next January.

Petrosyants Views 3d Round

LD010103 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Vladimir Dmitriyev video report on conclusion of 3d round of Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear tests]

[Text] [Announcer] In Geneva, the 3d round of Soviet-U.S. talks on halting nuclear tests has ended.

[Begin video recording] [Dmitriyev] We have witnessed here warm appreciation and approval by the representatives of international organizations in Geneva and Berne as well as by the public of neutral Switzerland for the USSR's decision on a bilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. When this decision was extended by us, more than a few kind words were expressed about our country.

Now at the end of this round and following a press conference conducted by the Soviet delegation, the local press is writing with disappointment about the results of the talks. The USSR representatives, it was stressed at the press conference, proceeded from the positive results of Reykjavik and sought to develop all the positive things achieved at the summit meeting, and on this basis, to reach specific accords that would lead to the complete banning of nuclear tests.

[A.M. Petrosyants, head of the Soviet delegation] The Soviet delegation insisted that this round should take place under the banner of preparations for a treaty on halting nuclear tests. We understand that, of course, it is not possible at short notice to prepare a treaty, as there is a whole series of attendant issues which have to be discussed and examined.

These are issues of monitoring [kontrol] the levels of force to nuclear blasts, the number of nuclear blasts, the duration of monitoring [kontrol], and the setting up the monitoring [kontrol] in accordance with the 1974-76 treaties.

But unfortunately, the U.S. delegation shied away from the resolution of these matters. The point is that the United States is continuing nuclear explosions, continuing to experiment, continuing to modernize and further improve its nuclear weapons, and therefore they are pushing the question of ending tests of nuclear weapons into a remote corner, indeed as a long-term goal. Furthermore, we pose the question: What does a long-term goal mean -- 1 year, 2 years, 3 years? No, it turns out this may be dragged out for many years, maybe 5 years, maybe even 10 years. Of course, we the Soviet delegation, the Soviet side, could not and cannot agree with this in any way.

STERN INTERVIEWS AKHROMEYEV ON DEFENSE

PM27142 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

["For the Good of Cooperation and Universal Security" -- IZYESTIYA headline]

[Text] -- Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of general staff of the Soviet Armed Forces and first deputy minister of defense of the USSR, gave an interview to the West German magazine STERN.

Answering questions put to him, he said, inter alia, that the reduction and eventual abolition of nuclear weapons was one of the main goals of Soviet foreign policy. In pursuing it, the USSR is not looking for one-sided advantage. The Soviet Union made a concession on several issues in Reykjavik to prompt the United States to make concessions in returning and embark on the road of real disarmament. However, the U.S. chase after the will-o'-the-wisp of military superiority over the USSR blocked possible accords in Reykjavik.

The Soviet proposals put forward in Reykjavik made it possible drastically to reduce the nuclear arms arsenals. What did the United States offer in reply? Nothing. While we made concession on strategic nuclear systems and medium-range missiles, the United States should have responded with concessions on space weapons. SDI is a program for the development and deployment of space strike weapons and the establishment of a national ABM system, which will drastically destablize the world situation. That is why the USSR cannot revise its stand on SDI.

Answering another question, Sergey Akhromeyev recalled that after military equilibrium was achieved in the early seventies between the United States and the USSR and between the NATO Bloc and the Warsaw Pact, the ABM and SALT Treaties were signed, which put a brake on and restricted the arms race. Reykjavik demonstrated that accords on radical cuts in the nuclear potentials were possible. President Ronald Reagan agreed in Reykjavik to Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals on the abolition of strategic nuclear weapons over 10 years. The only obstacle to that plan is the American 'Star Wars' program. All the peoples in the world would like the armed race stopped on earth and prevented in outer space. The American people also want it. It is only military-industrial complex and influential reactionary forces in the U.S. who are disregarding this demand of the peoples of the world.

Furthermore, when the interviews returned to Reykjavik, they were told that the USSR had not deviated one inch from their proposals. [paragraph continues]

As for the Americans, they have gone back on much of what was agreed in Reykjavik.

The Soviet Union is of the opinion that Reykjavik remains the starting point from which further progress can be made towards nuclear disarmament.

The interview rebutts the arguments that in tying the Reykjavik proposals into a package, the Soviet Union is sticking to the "all or nothing" principle. Our program for the abolition of nuclear weapons consists of three stages and envisions a gradual, step by step solution of the nuclear problem. The Soviet Union was prepared to make substantial concessions in Reykjavik for the radical solution of the problem of nuclear disarmament.

We proposed, inter alia, 50-percent cuts in the strategic offensive weapons without taking into account the U.S. forward-based nuclear systems, and the total abolition of medium-range missiles in Europe, leaving aside the British and French nuclear arms arsenals. The package of the Soviet proposals, including 50-percent cuts in and eventual total abolition of the strategic offensive weapons, relevant measures to tighten the ABM treaty, the elimination of medium-range missiles in Europe and a total nuclear test ban constitutes a complex of mutual interests and concessions of the sides. If any of the Soviet proposals is taken out of the package, the military balance would be upset in NATO's favor. The United States would like to take our concessions out of the package without giving anything in return. We will not agree to this.

The claim that the Soviet proposals are a result of the American "policy from strength" is a deliberate untruth and misinformation, the interview says. The Americans would now like to develop and deploy space strike weapons so as to achieve military superiority over us. But SDI will not help United States either. There are no absolute weapons. There is a counter-balance to every action, and every system, including a U.S. ABM system, can be effectively countered.

Sergey Akhromyev explained in the context of SDI that it is very difficult if at all possible to build a dependable ABM system on a country-wide scale if you don't know what the probable enemy is going to do: If it builds up its strategic arms arsenals or improves them qualitatively, if it relies on maneuvering warheads or hardens them. If there is no agreement to ban the deployment of a national ABM system, there will be no agreement on any reduction or limitation of strategic offensive weapons. There are knowledgeable and educated people in the U.S. Administration and they must understand this. But that administration must have other goals which make it impossible for it to drop SDI.

Answering a question about Soviet "research into the military uses of outer space," Sergey Akhromeyev said: We are not pursuing research to develop ABM space systems. There are studies to improve systems of warning against a missile attack, communications control and navigation systems [sredstv kontrolya svyazi navigatsii] and to develop ground-based ABM defenses within the limits of the ABM treaty. We are honoring the stipulations of the ABM treaty fully and painstakingly.

The interview explains why SDI is an offensive system. First, the weapons envisioned by the SDI program are strike weapons, with which the U.S. hopes to "blind" the other side, make it deaf and dumb, catch it unawares and deny it any possibility to retaliate against a nuclear attack. Second, having a range of 4,000-5,000 km, these systems can hit targets not only in outer space but also on the land and on the seas. They are adding to the strategic offensive potential and enabling it to deliver a first strike in the hope of impunity.

The USSR has a possibility of developing a dependable counterbalance to SDI. The United States is pressing towards an endless and uncontrollable arms race. The USSR, like most of the other countries of the world, have no use for it. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 27 November 1986 carries in its First Edition on page 5 under the headline "In the Interests of Peace and Universal Security" a version of this article, which deletes the above sentence. It is otherwise identical to the IZVESTIYA version.] Neither is the arms race needed to develop new technology.

The USSR proposes as a counter to SDI international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space, which offers great possibilities for the application of advanced technology both in space and on earth.

Having explained the Soviet stand on the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons and moving on to the question of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, Sergey Akhromeyev said that politically our moratorium became a touchstone to test particular countries' sincerity on disarmament. The American Administration failed this test of political maturity. But nuclear testing also is related to military equilibrium in the world. The United States has carried out 23 nuclear explosions since our moratorium was introduced. It is not easy for us to observe our moratorium during 18 months but we understand a need for it as a political measure and we are unanimous on this score. Soviet military agencies are analyzing the U.S. actions on nuclear testing and doing everything necessary to enable our leadership to keep up with the situation and correctly to evaluate it. It is the prerogative of the Soviet Government to decide how to act after January 1, 1987. Any measure taken by us for disarmament, including the moratorium, has its limits, which are determined by the security interests of the Soviet Union and its allies. [The Moscow PRAVDA version, already cited, deletes the above sentence, from "which are determined" to "and its allies."]

As there are claims that the Soviet Union does not honor confidence-building measures, the interview stresses that the Soviet Union always makes available all the essential information in the requisite volume. That was the case, for example, with data on strategic weapons, medium-range systems and missile launchings. We supplied not only numbers but also tactical and technological characteristics relating to the SS-20 missiles. That is why the claims about the Soviet Union's secretiveness in the military field are groundless. As for other areas, including the economy, the information supplied by our press, openness, exposure of shortcomings and their causes also give the lie to such claims.

As for the chemical weapons, it was stated that the Soviet Union stands for their total and universal prohibition, for the elimination of the existing stockpiles of such weapons and for the dismantling of the base for their production. We are also supporting intermediate steps, such as the ridding of all Europe of chemical weapons, the establishment of chemical weapon-free zones in Nordic and Central Europe and in the Balkans, the non-transfer of chemical weapons to other countries and a ban on their deployment in foreign territory. If the United States and other NATO countries wanted it, a convention on these issues could be concluded already in 1987.

Answering another question, Sergey Akhromeyev said that when the Vienna talks on the armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe had begun, both sides seemed to have evaluated the situation not quite correctly and singled out in European territory the NATO armed forces deployed in West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg and, for the other side, the armed forces of the GDR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Soviet troops deployed in that area. We have come to the conclusion, Akhromeyev said, that carrying on the Vienna talks, it is clearly easier to solve the problem of reductions in the armed forces and conventional armaments if we take the armed forces of the sides in the whole of Europe, from the Urals to the Atlantic.

When the point was raised of the American' intention to exceed the limits put on the number of the nuclear bombers by the SALT II treaty and the marshal was asked about the Soviet Union's reaction, he said that if the United States violated the SALT II treaty, the Soviet Union would have the right to consider itself free of its commitments under the treaty.

Sergey Akhromeyev said that we believe in a world without nuclear weapons and are working to achieve it. The peoples of the world have a great role to play in these efforts. They can make the enemies of disarmament reach agreement and halt the nuclear arms race. However, there is the danger that before the world reaches this point, war can cancel out everything. That is why we are so persevering in our efforts to achieve our goal, a world without nuclear weapons.

As for the arguments voiced in the West that it is necessary to have at least a small atomic arms arsenal as a safeguard against some mad statesman threatening to use atomic weapons, it is a reservation of those who do not want to disarm and to abolish nuclear armaments. If such powers as the USSR, the United States, China, Britain, and France dismantle their nuclear arms potentials, they will find the means of convincing the other countries to join us in that noble goal, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev said in conclusion. [Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Second Edition on 27 November 1986 reports the Akhromeyev interview on page 3 under the headline "In the Interests of Peace and Universal Security". This version is identical to the IZVESTIYA version.]

SPECIAL ENVOY BRIEFS PRC ON ARMS TALKS WITH U.S.

LD281125 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Text] Beijing November 28 TASS -- A special Soviet envoy, Ambassador Lem Masterkov who leads a negotiating group at Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, stayed here on November 25 through 28. He briefed the Chinese side on the results of the 6th round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

Masterkov had meetings with Qian Qichen, a deputy foreign minister of the People's Republic of China, Li Daoyu, head of the Department of International Organizations and Conferences of the Chinese Foreign Ministry, and other officials.

PETROVSKIY ON NEED FOR 'CONSTRUCTIVE' ARMS TALKS

LD291147 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2200 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said that the USSR advocates the continuation of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons. In statements to EFE agency in Madrid the deputy foreign minister said that the negotiations must be constructive in order to lead to positive results. Vladimir Petrovskiy stressed that in Geneva (?they will strive) to develop all the positive things achieved at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik where an understanding was practically reached on the elimination of nuclear weapons in a period of 10 years. As is known, this understanding has not been realized because of the U.S. refusal to observe the ABM Treaty and confine its work on SDI to the laboratory.

DELEGATE CRITICIZES U.S. STANCE AT CSCE

LD012024 Moscow TASS in English 1946 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Vienna December 1 TASS -- "The U.S. Administration's actions undermining SALT-2 open up the road to an uncontrolled buildup of strategic offensive arms," said Major-General Tatarnikov, a member of the Soviet delegation, at the Vienna meeting of representatives from the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Addressing a full-delegation meeting, he said that the United States continued working toward the realization of the SDI program.

"This means the transfer of the arms race to space and the erosion of the ABM treaty. Such an approach attests to the fact that the course toward renouncing U.S. commitments under treaties has prevailed in Washington. This cannot but cause concern also among the participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe," the speaker emphasized.

The Soviet representative gave a well-reasoned reply to the U.S. side's attempts to accuse the Soviet Union of violating its commitments concerning the limitation of strategic offensive arms and those arising from the ABM treaty.

It is noted here that in recent time the delegations of the United States and some of its allies have been trying to aggravate the atmosphere at the Vienna meeting, turn it into an arena of confrontation and steer it away from discussing really important issues of confidence and security building in Europe.

Report Contrasts East, West

LD261504 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 26 Nov 86

[Text] Vienna November 26 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Revyakin reports:

Two approaches have jelled up at the Vienna meeting of the representative of the CSCE states in discussing trade, economic, scientific and technological cooperation. The delegates of the socialist countries stand for a constructive East-West dialogue and have put forward a series of concrete proposals to promote in every way the development of business contacts between the CSCE countries. The Western delegates are trying to avoid the vital problem of removing obstacles to trade and to shift emphasis to secondary problems such as foreign trade statistics, telephone communications and contacts with "end consumer".

Delegates from the USA, Britain, and some other Western countries claim that centralized planning and the monopoly of foreign trade in socialist countries are the main barrier to trade between states with different socio-economic systems.

Some Western delegations are also trying to link progress in discussions on trade at the Vienna meeting to the state of affairs in other areas of the European process, primarily in the humanitarian field.

The delegations of socialist countries cite concrete examples to show how the policy of sanctions, embargoes and technological and crediting blockades pursued by the USA and other Western countries adversely affects the overall climate of East-West business cooperation.

The CEMA member-countries are simultaneously calling for a constructive tenor of discussions on economic, scientific and technological problems.

The Soviet delegation explains that a complex of measures carried out in our country to improve external economic relations is offering great opportunities for extending and developing economic cooperation. It says that it is important to reach an agreement on the establishment of a system of international economic security in the region further to boost trade.

DRUZHININ COMPARES BONN-PRETORIA, U.S.-IRAN

LD011747 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Next, a commentary by Aleksandr Druzhinin. This is what he writes:

The scandal involving American arms shipments to Iran is snowballing Washington. In the meantime, on the other side of the Atlantic, in Bonn, a shady affair very much like the American Irangate has surfaced. Reports emerged that the blueprints and technical documentation of an advanced submarine had been secretly sold to the Pretoria regime by the West German shipbuilders Howaltswerke Deutsche Werft. The company got DM 46 million from the racists. Moreover, apart from blueprints, as a spokesman for the office of the West German chancellor gave to understand, the deal also involved already-built submarines and spare parts to them. It's noteworthy that both in Washington and in Bonn the highest government circles are attempting to dissociate themselves from the secret machinations with weaponry. Washington has found scapegoats: The presidential national security adviser and one of his staffers resigned. The Bonn politicians also pretend that they knew nothing about the sale of submarines to the racists, though, according to reports, Chancellor Kohl sanctioned the transaction back in 1984.

Apart from this outward resembalance, the American and West German official circles abused their own laws and United Nations bans when they dispatched weaponry to the most explosive regions of the world. The American arms shipments to Iran futher aggravated the thunderous atmosphere of the Middle East. As for military cooperation between Bonn and Pretoria, it obviously encouraged the apartheid regime to commit more crimes and worsen the situation in the south of Africa.

It's clear that Washington and Bonn have common goals. They obviously believe that it's easier to spread their influence to other parts of the world in conditions of artificially kindled tensions.

CONTINUING COVERAGE OF U.S. IRAN ARMS SALES

Reagan Meets With Commission

LD020004 Moscow TASS in English 2350 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Washington December 2 TASS -- TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin reports:

On Monday President Reagan held at the White House a conference with members of the commission appointed by him to investigate the role of the U.S. National Security Council in the context of the ongoing Washington scandal around the secret "Iranian operation." The commission is supposed to investigate arms shipments to Iran and the transfer of some profits from sales to accounts of anti-Nicaraguan units.

Judging by an official statement circulated after conference, the U.S. President actually tried to disassociate himself fully fron any complicity in the Iranian scandal. He said that he would like the commission to concentrate on NSC staffers.

Thus, the U.S. President frankly intimated what conclusion he was waiting from commission members: to whitewash the administration and to pass off "Irangate" as an affair of "individual" staff members of the National Security Council who got out of control of the leaders.

Zhukov Commentary

PM011559 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[Yuriy Zhukov "Political Observer's Notes": "In The Pillory"]

[Text] Not a day passes without a new batch of details from Washington on the unheard-of political scandal that has shaken the U.S. Administration to its foundations.

It all began on 5 October when a U.S. aircraft, painted in camouflage colors and crammed with weapons addressed to the notorious "contras," was shot down in Nicaragua. U.S. Administration spokesmen immediately stated that the American Hasenfus, who had been caught red-handed delivering the weapons, had been acting on instructions from "private organizations." But then it became clear that Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North, a National Security Council aide, had been involved in the deliveries -- this was confirmed by former presidential assistant Robert McFarlane.

It was not long after that North, and McFarlane to boot, were exposed as having been involved in illegally supplying Iran with weapons at a time when there was an embargo on supplies, an embargo imposed by the United States and its allies.

A scandal broke out. The U.S. Congress took umbrage, while the U.S. NATO allies, whom Washington had strictly forbidden to sell weapons to Iran, were furious. Even the conservative London paper the SUNDAY TELEGRAPH was outraged by what it called this "horrific demonstration of American stupidity, duplicity, and incompetence."

On 19 November the U.S. President held a press conference in a clumsy attempt to justify his administration's conduct. He cynically stated that "the game... was worth the candle," that the "President -- believe it or not (!) -- has the right to defer reporting to Congress" on the shipment of weapons without its knowledge in the hope of "putting Iran back on its former (that is, pro-American! -- Yu. Zhukov) path."

All these revelations not only failed to calm Americans, but, in fact, made them even more agitated. As the Paris paper LE MONDE wrote on 21 November, even the U.S. press began to "tear to shreds this political figure whom only recently they had been praising to the skies (with rare exceptions)."

But this was just a foretaste. The president reaped the bitter fruit on 24 and then on 25 November, when two more point-blank exposes occurred one after the other.

On 24 November THE WALL STREET JOURNAL reported that "some of the U.S. weapons secretly sent to Iran were destined for Muslim guerrillas fighting... in Afghanistan." The next day the President himself and his personal friend, Attorney General E. Meese, admitted to correspoondents in the White House that "money from the controversial (!) arms supplies has been secretly transferred to the Nicaraguan 'contras'" and that this had been done by the selfsame National Security Council aide, Lt Col North, with the actual blessing of the President's national security assistant, Admiral Poindexter.

As our Washington correspondent reported in PRAVDA yesterday, truly monstrous machinations were revealed in the process. Acting as an intermediary between the United States and Iran, Israel, which received the weapons for the sum of 12 million dollars, fleeced the Iranians, took a further 30 million or so dollars in excess of that sum, and transferred them to Swiss banks in the name of the Nicaraguan "contras"!

This closed the circle which had begun to be drawn on 5 October, when the Nicaraguans shot down the U.S. aircraft loaded with weapons for the rebels. It is now clear that the "private donations" which Washington went on about at the time were Iranian money, swindled out of the Iranians by Israel for weapons supplied by the United States through Israel to Iran.

The white House naively thinks that it will be able to stifle this unprecedented scandal by placing all the blame on Lt Col O. North, who has now been made the scapegoat and who is charged with having contrived to push through this very extensive strategic military plan without the authorities' knowledge. He was simply dismissed and threatened with 5 years' imprisonment for "taking the law into his own hands." Admiral Poindexter also got a roasting and had to resign for allegedly overlooking the fact that the wily lieutenant colonel had been "taking the law into his own hands."

Will Congress take the bait and spare the President's prestige? It seems unlikely somehow. The senators and congressmen are in uproar at the moment, demanding the identification and punishment of those who were actually behind these unprecedented dealings. Let us wait and see how events turn out.

One thing is clear, though: The U.S. Administration is in the pillory!

VASILIYEV CRITICIZES U.S. CAMPAIGN AGAINST SYRIA

LD281402 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS -- TASS commentator Grigoriy Vasiliyev reports:

A malicious anti-Syrian campaign orchestrated by Washington is gaining in scope. Syria is being fiercely attacked along all directions. Measures taken against it are ranging from economic 'sanctions' and subversive diplomatic actions to open blackmail and the threats to use force against that sovereign Arab country.

However, it is clear that no profuse talk about non-existent 'complicity' of Syria in terrorism cannot conceal the fact that the root cause of all the recent developments in this sphere is the utmost irritation of Washington and its allies over the independent anti-imperialist policy chosen by the people and the leadership of Syria, over its consistent struggle against the Israeli aggression, for a truly just and durable Middle East settlement. The anti-Syrian hysteria which is being whipped up today falls in line with the policy basically hostile to the Arabs which has been pursued in the Middle East by the U.S. Administration that replaced one another for several decades. It is obviously aimed at imposing the imperialist-zionist diktat on the peoples and countries of that region.

The U.S. is exerting open and gross pressure on its allies by the NATO bloc with a view to making them take a more active part in the anti-Syrian campaign. It is obviously under the influence of the pressure that the West German Government announced the expulsion from the FRG of three Syrian diplomats and the 'reduction' of the staff of the military attache office of Syria in West Germany which can now consist of only two people. Bonn is planning to take other anti-Syrian measures, specifically, economic ones.

The threats hurled at Syria are acquiring an ever more sinister militaristic character. It is becoming every more obvious that Israel is being pushed in every way towards starting an armed aggression against Syria. However, it is common knowledge what a severe blow was dealt to the interests of West European countries as a result of the 1967 Israeli aggression, because they depend on Arab oil deliveries much more than the U.S.

Syria is not alone in its struggle against the intrigues and impudent threats of U.S. imperialism and its allies. It is supported by broad circles of the progressively-minded world public, by socialist countries. The Soviet Union warned resolutely and in no uncertain terms about the dangerous consequences of the anti-Syrian campaign unleashed by Washington and Tel Aviv, primarily for those who started it. However, the recent developments show that some forces are impatient to further their aims.

It is worth pointing out that the joint participation of the 'strategic partners' by the anti-Arab alliance, of Washington and Tel Aviv, in the kindling of the Iranian-Iraqi armed conflict is obviously aimed at splitting the ranks of those who could offer effective resistance to the Israeli aggression. In these conditions the consolidation of the unity of Arabs on the anti-imperialist basis, of their resolve to uphold their national interests is becoming an urgent necessity.

NPC ECONOMIC DELEGATION BEGINS MOSCOW VISIT

PM011517 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 86 Morning Edition p 3

[TASS report: "PRC Parliamentarians' Visit"]

[Text] A delegation of the Financial and Economic Committee of the Chinese National People's Congress [NPC] headed by Ye Lin, member of the NPC Standing Committee and vice chairman of the commission, arrived in Moscow 30 November for an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' Plan and Budget Commissions.

The delegation was greeted at the airport by N.I. Maslennikov and L.V. Radyukevich, deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, other officials, and Li Zewang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

On the same day a meeting was held with the delegation at the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' Plan and Budget Commissions.

AMITY SOCIETY CONFERENCE HELD IN MOSCOW 25 NOV

OW280109 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0300 GMT 26 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The Fourth All-Union Conference of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society was held in Moscow 25 November. The conference delegates summed up the society's activities, outlined directions for its further work, and adopted a charter. It was noted that the consistent course of the CPSU and the Soviet state to developing friendship and goodneighborliness with the PRC serves the interests of the two great peoples. (Li Fenlin), counsellor minister of the PRC Embassy in the USSR, addressed the conference and read the greetings of the PRC-USSR Friendship Association Central Board to the Fourth All-Union Conference.

INSTITUTE OF USA, CANADA DELEGATION VISITS PRC

LD281407 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Text] Beijing November 28 TASS -- A delegation of the Institute of the USA and Canada (USSR Academy of Sciences) led by Vitaliy Zhurkin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy director of the Institute, stayed in China at the invitation of the Institute of Modern International Problems attached to the State Council of the PRC. It had meetings with leading Chinese experts on issues of world economics and international relations.

During talks and discussions the sides examined issues of limiting and reducing armaments, strengthening international security, Soviet-American and American-Chinese relations, as well as questions of the Asian and Pacific region. They also exchanged opinions on questions of developing Soviet-Chinese relations in various fields, including extension of relations between scientists of the two countries. The delegation was received by Huan Xiang, director of the Research Centre of International Problems of the PRC's State Council and well-known specialist on international relations.

Apart from Beijing, the delegation visited Shanghai, Guangzhou and some other Chinese cities.

REPORTAGE ON ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCE IN JAPAN

Ryzhkov Message

LD301901 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 30 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 30 TASS -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers sent a message of greetings to participants in the 5th round-table conference of representatives of the Soviet and Japanese public which is to discuss the role of the Soviet and the Japanese public in ensuring peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region.

"The present meeting of representatives of the Soviet and Japanese public is to promote the consolidation of good neighbourly relations, mutual understanding between our two nations and the development of cooperation among all the Asian and Pacific countries. The Soviet Union regards as important the active drawing of this vast region into the general process of the creation of the system of international security", the message noted.

"The purpose of our proposals is to work step by step, through pooling efforts with countries and peoples of the Asian-Pacific region, for its turning into a zone of peace and security, of equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation".

"The Soviet Union attaches much importance to the development of relations with Japan. We positively assess the recent signs of the improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations and believe that there exist extensive potentialities of their further expansion in many areas. Provided there is good will and the striving for a dynamic and realistic policy, these potentialities can find their expression in mutually advantageous agreements and understandings", the message said.

Voss-Led Delegation Arrives

LD281842 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 28 TASS -- A Soviet delegation led by Avgust Voss, chairman of the soviet of nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, left Moscow for Tokyo today. It will participate in the fifth "round table" conference of the Soviet and Japanese public.

Talks Open

LD011833 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Tokyo December 1 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Vladimir Kuchko

The fifth Japano-Soviet round-table conference opened today. Its topic is "The Role of the Public in the U.S.S.R. and Japan in Ensuring Peace and Security in Asia and the Pacific Region."

Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone of Japan addressed messages to the delegates.

Addressing the opening ceremony, Tadashi Kuranari, the Japanese foreign minister, said that some positive tendencies had made themselves felt in Japano-Soviet relations in recent time. He came out in favor of promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries.

At the same time he tried once again to link progress in bilateral relations with the meeting of illegal territorial claims made on the Soviet Union.

"The existing international situation imperatively demands a new approach to security problems," said Avgust Voss, the head of the Soviet delegation, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities (one of the two equal chambers) of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (Parliament). He called the attention of the delegates to a series of recent major Soviet initiatives.

"The Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik signifies a qualitatively new stage in the campaign to safeguard peace," he said. "The implementation of the Soviet proposals, if they had been adopted, would have marked the beginning of the process of elimination of nuclear weapons. Effective actions by all states are required now for the benefit of stronger international peace."

"The Soviet Union would like to regard Japan above all as a partner in common efforts to ensure security the world over and in the Asian and Pacific region. The Soviet Union and Japan, cooperating with each other, could make a valuable contribution to stronger peace, promote the lessening of tensions and the development of positive political processes," Avgust Voss went on.

"The Soviet proposals set forth in the Vladivostok speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, are designed to attain these aims. They make it possible to secure the inclusion of the Asian and Pacific region into the common process of establishing a comprehensive system of international security," the head of the Soviet delegation said.

Meeting With Politicians

LD011723 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] Tokyo December 1 TASS -- Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, leading a Soviet delegation at the "round table" conference of the Soviet and Japanese public, under way here, had today a meeting with Kenzaburo Hara, speaker of the Japanese House of Representatives. During the talk the sides discussed issues on expanding parliamentary contacts and developing relations between standing commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Japanese Parliament.

The same day Avgust Voss met Japanese Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari.

U.S. DEPLOYING 'NEW CLASS' OF ARMS IN KOREA

PM011423 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

["TASS Statement" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The United States has taken another step to further heighten international tension, by deciding to site its Lance operational-tactical missiles in South Korea.

Over the years the U.S. military has already made South Korea into an explosive nuclear staging area where hundreds of nuclear munitions and numerous delivery systems for them have been deployed -- from artillery pieces to newest aircraft.

What is meant now is, in addition to this nuclear potential, to deploy a new class of arms -- land-based missiles which can carry either conventional or nuclear and neutron warheads.

Significantly, the United States has taken this action at a historic moment when, as a result of constructive initiatives by the USSR, the contours of a nuclear-free world have come to be really visible and the peoples have become justifiably optimistic about prospects for drastic cuts in nuclear weapons and their elimination.

In Asian and Pacific countries sentiment has begun to grow and solidify against the proliferation and buildup of nuclear arms in that region.

The increasingly high public awareness of the nuclear danger has been impelling different countries to make proposals aimed at turning vast areas in the region into nuclear-free zones, limit sailing and port calls by naval ships with nuclear weapons, and effect other measures of military detente.

There is also an increasingly strong desire to improve the situation and strengthen security in the Korean peninsula itself, which has been reflected in peace initiatives by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to strengthen peace and make the entire peninsula a nuclear-free zone.

Far-reaching Soviet proposals directed at lowering tension and strengthening security and state-to-state cooperation in Asia and the Pacific have been consonant with all these positive trends.

By deciding to move its operational-tactical missiles to South Korea, the United States has ostentatiously defied the peoples' desire to limit and reverse the nuclear arms race.

The United States is effectively lending new nuclear-missile parameters to the military situation in the Far East.

Although these are yet limited-range systems, their deployment may prove just the beginning, a first step on the road of building up more dangerous and destructive kinds of nuclear-missile arms threatening all countries of the region.

The stationing of new American weapons in that part of the planet, which as a result of U.S. globalist policy already is among the focal points of tension and dangerous confrontation, gives lie to U.S. claims of being eager to settle regional conflicts.

For the Korean people, the deployment of new missiles in the south of their country spells a continued widening of its split and even more logjams in the way of a peaceful reunification of their homeland and social progress.

Such U.S. actions cannot but be justly condemned and protested.

They make it utterly clear yet again that in scaling up its military preparations, the United States remains the initiator of a continued escalation of the arms race in new areas.

In Washington they should realize that the full weight of responsibility for the dangerous consequences of American nuclear missile deployments in South Korea is on the United States.

GORBACHEV, GANDHI HOLD JOINT NEWS CONFERENCE

Moscow TV Version

LD282047 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Joint news conference held by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev and Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in New Delhi on 28 November; Gandhi speaks in English with superimposed Russian translation; from the "Vremya" newscast -- recorded]

[Text] [Gandhi] Esteemed General Secretary! Esteemed ladies and gentlemen! Friends! I feel that the visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to India is an important landmark on the path of strengthening Soviet-Indian relations. It confirms the vital force of friendly relations between our peaceful countries. We have held very wide discussions. They lasted for about 10 hours. I am referring to the talks between just the two of us. I think they were fruitful. They were held in an atmosphere of warmth and trust. And there were other discussions too, at different levels.

The results of this visit are of great importance for bilateral ties, for the stability of the situation in the region, and -- perhaps most important -- for strengthening peace throughout the whole world. We have discussed many questions of mutual interest. First of all, questions concerning peace, nuclear disarmament, and development. We have signed a number of agreements. Perhaps the most important document is the Delhi Declaration that we signed yesterday with the general secretary. This sets forth the principles for a nonnuclear world, for a nonviolent world. We have signed an agreement on economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, and a consular convention, a protocol on holding festivals in the two countries, and a joint statement will be published at the end of the visit.

These agreements are a testimony to the maturity, stability, and dynamism that characterize Soviet-Indian friendship. The Delhi declaration is a historic document. Its international significance will increase in time. It is making a major contribution to international relations for which cooperation and peace are the main characteristics.

The economic agreement that we have signed is the most major agreement ever signed between our two countries. It covers new projects in different fields of the national economy. There are two new elements in this economic agreement: Local costs financing and the turnkey approach. Of course, we will use these methods wherever they are useful for us. We have also agreed that trade turnover between India and the Soviet Union will grow by approximately two and a half times by 1992. We will study new forms and new methods of economic cooperation. Our minister of finance and Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, will carry out further discussions on this question. We will give new qualitative impulses to the development of science and technology. We intend to carry out joint research in the field of advanced technologies and thereafter we intend to go over to joint production of these technologies.

We have invited academician Marchuk to come to India. The general secretary has agreed to send a delegation headed by Academician Marchuk to examine all these aspects, and then we shall take further steps on the basis of the results of this trip. Finally, I want to say that this visit is for us a fruitful one and evokes a feeling of tremendous satisfaction in us. This is yet another major step in Soviet-Indian relations.

Now I would like to hand over the platform to General Secretary Gorbachev. This is his first visit to India. Unfortunately, he has been unable to familiarize himself extensively with India. But we hope that he will come see us again and will better acquaint himself with our country. Over to you, General Secretary Gorbachev.

[Gorbachev] Respected Mr Prime Minister, respected ladies and gentlemen, comrades and friends! I must say, Mr Prime Minister, that you have made my mission both easier and at the same time more difficult. You have already said the main things. I could limit myself to just several remarks, or several words, or even one or two words perhaps by saying that I am fully in agreement with what you have said. But I think that then our colleagues in this meeting, the journalists, will be dissatisfied.

I want to say something about the atmosphere of the visit. The atmosphere has been good, friendly, and sincere. Our conversations have taken place in a spirit of openness, deep mutual understanding, and this has enabled us to discuss a wide range of issues and a wide range of matters of mutual interest to the Soviet Union and India.

Our current visit is one of the landmarks on the road of lengthy and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and India. And it seems to me that everything is clear here; there is nothing unusual -- it is a confirmation of our regular ties, our deepening ties, but at the same time there are also distinguishing features about this visit, and I would like to discuss them. These features are linked first of all to the internal development of our countries. Both the Soviet Union and India have entered a phase of historic development where they have set for themselves major goals and put forward major tasks. It is natural that this also makes other demands on our cooperation. We have come to share the views of the Prime Minister, seeing our task as lying not only in preserving what has been created in our relations by previous generations, but also in trying to make our contribution and promote our relations, deepen them, and attain new forms of cooperation. There is also another feature of the current visit. Our understanding is that the world situation requires that such an enormous factor as Soviet-Indian cooperation -- a powerful factor, a factor of huge international significance -- acquire even greater importance in the world. Over these last few days we have felt our responsibility, not just to our people, but also to the people of all countries and to the whole world for the policy we are carrying out and for the steps we will be taking -- on an interactive basis or independently, as has been the case heretofore -- in the interests of strengthening peace and preventing the threat of nuclear war.

I think that these features that I have briefly spoken of give you the opportunity to understand why the visit was arranged as it was. For the most part, we spent these days in conversation. On this occasion we did not have the opportunity -- I consider this to be a great shortcoming that will have to be overcome in the future -- to travel around India. Life goes on, cooperation is expanding, contacts will deepen, our relations will become more dynamic, there will be more meetings, and I think if there is another opportunity I will avail myself of what the prime minister said just now to meet India on my next trip.

We did a great deal of work with the prime minister. Now that the visit is ending, and we are summarizing its outcome, I think that our efforts have not been in vain. We have indeed spent many hours together on a one-to-one basis. This gave us the opportunity to examine thoroughly all the areas of our cooperation, all matters relating both to our bilateral relations and to international problems and regional problems. This was a genuine and rich dialogue covering the deepest issues of world development and bilateral links between our countries.

I say once more: Tremendous and extensive work has been carried out. This work, as we agree with the prime minister, has enabled us to advance a long way the political dialogue and reach important accords in the spheres of politics, economics, scientific-technical links, and in the cultural sphere.

If I were to outline the main result of this visit, I would say that it has made it possible to augment the potential for friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India. During the visit we felt once more both the importance that Soviet-Indian relations have today and our responsibility to our people and to the whole world. Perhaps this importance above all flows from the fact that what we are dealing with are relations between states having different social systems and histories and with a great distinctiveness regarding national and spiritual traditions.

Decades of mutually advantageous and honest cooperation is a powerful and distinctive phenomenon of the present day that has become an important factor in international policy.

I do not want to be indiscreet and even less to put the prime minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi, into an embarrassing position. But I would like to say that perhaps in relations, in today's relations between India and the Soviet Union, the principles of peaceful coexistence have been embodied to the fullest. This is why they merit attention.

As for us, the leaders of these countries, it is our job to make sure that these relations correspond to these principles to a greater and fuller extent at the new stage of world history -- principles that I hope we all share. It is a different matter how we implement them in practice. But here there is not only adherence in the sense of political declaration, but also adherence in deeds to these principles. We are proud of this. Why should we not be proud of this if there are politicians who find completely different reasons, even dubious ones, to take pride in something? Here there are fundamental reasons for being proud of this. But this also means that one must be responsible for this.

The high level of our relations has made it possible to sign such a document as the declaration of the principles of a nonviolent world free from nuclear weapons.

The prime minister and I signed this declaration yesterday and I am in complete agreement with the broad and cogent reasoning used here by Mr Gandhi in revealing the meaning, characterizing the meaning of this important political document. It is indeed an extremely out-of-the-ordinary document, a document of great international significance. It reflects the role of the Soviet Union and India in world affairs and their moral right to issue such an appeal to the whole of mankind. Yes, we are convinced that we have the moral right, had the moral right to put forth a document such as the declaration.

The declaration reflects our and the Indian points of view on the most vitally important issues in the contemporary world. In any case, in this document the world community has the opportunity to see the orientation of our thoughts and our true intentions and objectives.

A joint statement was also signed yesterday, and it is also unusual in the range of issues and in the two states' proximity of views and approaches to topical issues of world politics.

An agreement on economic and technical cooperation was signed, and here I want to repeat what has been said by Mr Prime Minister that this is the most major agreement in the history of relations between us in this sphere.

A protocol was signed on festivals in India and the Soviet Union devoted to two memorable dates in the history of our states -- the 70th anniversary of our revolution and the 40th anniversary of independent India. The scale and the content of these festivals corresponds to the importance of these events. I think that this will bring our people even closer together.

All the same, in talking about the documents that have been signed as a result of the visit I must note the following: As rich as the content of these documents is, what arose during the course of the talks themselves goes far beyond what is contained within them and promises results that are even more momentous for both our countries. Of course, such major measures to deepen interaction presuppose that all those who will be tasked with implementing all this in practical terms will have a great deal to do; but I am confident that given the fact that the political will exists, that there is confidence, that the atmosphere is one of no prejudice and shared desire to take each other's interests into consideration and to help each other and cooperate with one another, then everything that has been put down and planned here in Delhi can -- and I would also like to say immediately must -- be implemented. At any rate, the prime minister and I are deeply committed to this goal.

I was greatly impressed by the way in which the envoys of the Soviet Union were received in Delhi, in India. I want to mention this, having mentioned here the meeting in the parliament and this memorable document which will remain as part of the history of both our countries. We have had the opportunity to meet public figures and members of the friendship society and the society for cultural relations with the USSR. They came from different parts of India and different states in order to welcome the delegation of the Soviet Union; these are well-known and respected people of merit. In the words spoken by them -- words of emotion, words of solemn occasion -- they strove to bring home to us deep feelings of friendship and warmth towards the Soviet Union and our people on the part of the Indian people. These were moving and memorable meetings and we will convey these feelings to our people.

I would like to avail myself of this opportunity to thank the citizens of India and all organizations which have made possible the success of this visit; and to thank them for the warmth and the attention with which we have been surrounded during these days, for the liberality with which the Indians have revealed to us their plans and their concerns. Here in India my comrades and I could not fail to feel just how close and how much in keeping with each other are the spiritual aspirations of our two peoples. Our countries are countries whose historic destiny is not easy. There have been many bitter pages in the history of both India and our country. Perhaps that is why responsiveness to other people's pain, the desire for justice and the will for peace and freedom are so strong in the Soviet and Indian peoples.

Returning to the content of the talks during the visit, I would like to say that there was not one single meeting which did not have at its center the most burning questions of international life. Mr Gandhi and I are in agreement that the Soviet Union and India consider it to be the primary task to rid the world of nuclear weapons, to overcome tension, to cool down the hot spots of the world. We believe that it is possible to do this, that it is possible to achieve this, not by way of confrontation and enmity, not by way of the absurd build up of force. The position of strength -- and I already spoke about this yesterday -- is calculated to bring about subjection to other people's will, encroachment of some people's interests, or simply the suppression of those not to one's liking. But we are deeply convinced that there is no future in such a position, and that its presence is totally unenviable and quite simply shameful.

The roads to the future are to be found by the assertion of new political thinking, by the understanding of nuclear space realities, by being aware of the interdependence of all countries, all people; and all states should take part in the construction of peace and reliable security.

In conclusion, I want to say that while still in Moscow on the eve of the visit, I received hundreds of telegrams and letters from Indian organizations and citizens, letters imbued with warm feelings of well-wishing toward the Soviet Union and our people. There were many invitations to visit. I have already said that I promise next time to visit many places in India. From the bottom of my heart I thank Indian citizens, public organizations, organs of the press for their warm words and good wishes and for their feeling of well-wishing toward the Soviet people and our country. I would like, in particular, to single out and convey my greetings and gratitude for the wishes expressed by the Indian youth, students and school youth whom I saw, unfortunately, only from my car. But I think we will meet them again. I would very much like them to know that I deeply value their feelings which they showed to our delegation, to our people, to the Soviet Union, in the past few days. Thank you. [applause]

[Question by unidentified correspondent -- vernacular with Russian translation] As we have just heard from your statement, the talks were rich and touched on a wide range of matters. Previously we were told that basic attention would be devoted to a discussion of regional problems. Could you not dwell in more detail on the militarization of Pakistan by the United States; which is clearly seen from here in India?

[Gorbachev] I understand, thank you. We are all -- the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan -- neighbors. And I think that neighbors should always live by cooperating, helping one another and building their relations in the spirit of mutual understanding. I think that what I say is also India's position, that we are in favor of good relations with the Pakistani people and that it is necessary to find ways to reach such relations. Other roads lead to unpredictable things and we must all remember this. I think this also applies fully to the Government of Pakistan.

[Question by unidentified correspondent in Russian] Mr Prime Minister, in his address in parliament Comrade Gorbachev, concerning the expansion of international cooperation on the peaceful exploitation of outer space, proposed that an international center be set up on Indian soil for the study of space, the training of cosmonauts, and the launching of artificial satellites. What do you think? Is it possible to carry out such an idea?

[Gandhi] We think this is a very good idea. But this matter must be discussed in detail in order to implement it. We have not examined it in detail yet, but I am confident we shall deal with this.

[Question by unidentified correspondent, in English with superimposed Russian translation] Your excellency! You are striving to achieve an improvement in relations with China. You spoke of this in Vladivostok and we wish you success in this matter. But we would like to ask a question of great interest to us. Are you trying to normalize your relations with China? Is there a possibility of using influence to find a solution to the matter of our long-standing border disputes? You, of course, know that China has recently taken certain steps that are a departure from the position taken up by it. What can be done to make sure that there are no such departures and that this does not have an effect on the relations between the Soviet Union and India?

[Gorbachev] Regarding the latter wish, I have already spoken about this. What we are doing in improving our relations with China will not weaken our relations with India. These steps will never do damage to India. On the contrary, we shall deepen our relations with India. The present visit is direct evidence of this. The better the relations we have in the Asiatic region between all countries -- I mean the better the relations between the Soviet Union and China are, too -- then the better the whole atmosphere will be in this region. When the atmosphere improves, when cooperation and mutual understanding expand and more trust comes about, then I think this will have an effect on the policies of all states. I apply this to the Soviet Union, too. I think India will act in a similarly responsible manner in this situation; I am convinced of this, because we have a great deal of experience in relations with India. I think that the Chinese Government will act in a similarly responsible manner -- I have no doubts about this.

[Question by unidentified correspondent] A question for the Indian prime minister. Speaking over the last few days, and at today's press conference, you have cited technology and the latest achievements of the scientific and technological revolution as being the new long-term field for India-Soviet cooperation. The space center has already been talked about here. Along what other lines and in what new forms can this cooperation, in your opinion, first develop? Thank you.

[Gandhi] Like I said in my earlier remarks, we discussed a wide range of issues. We feel that issues related to science and technology should be left to the specialists, scientists, and academicians -- Marchuk in particular -- who will go into them in detail. Only after that will we examine the issues relating to collaboration and cooperation.

[Question by unidentified correspondent, in English with superimposed Russian translation] General Secretary, how do you view China's intrusion in the Northeast of the Indian-Chinese frontier? What is the Soviet position on this issue?

[Gorbachev] I could confine myself to what I have already said; I think that both sides want to solve the border issues that the two sides, the two states, have, in a spirit of mutual understanding on the basis of a political settlement, and I think that this is a very proper approach. I would welcome it.

[Question by unidentified correspondent, in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mr General Secretary, there are now 5 million Afghan refugees in the world, in Iran and in Pakistan. And now, after the signing of the declaration of human rights, when will Soviet troops be withdrawn from Afghanistan so that the refugees can return home?

[Gorbachev] I will reply to your question, although I have already dealt with this problem fairly broadly in my interview with Indian journalists. We favor a political settlement of the issue of Afghanistan. The more quickly agreement is reached precisely on such an approach, the better it will be both for Afghanistan and for its neighbors -- when I talk about Afghanistan I also have in mind the problem of refugees. The only thing is that I cannot agree with you that the problem of refugees is connected to the problem of the introduction of Soviet troops, with the temporary bringing in, at the invitation of the government, of Soviet troops into Afghanistan.

We are devoted to a political settlement and will take up an active stance on this, and we invite all sides which have something to do with this problem to cooperate. I want to repeat yet again: There are prospects for settling this problem in the near future. That is our assessment, and we will act proceeding from this assessment.

[Question by unidentified correspondent] A question for Mr Gandhi. Mr Prime Minister, at present there is a process under way to actively militarize the Indian Ocean. It is noteworthy that there are no nuclear powers on the shores of the ocean, all the weapons are imported. Soon a conference is to be held on turning the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. What, in your opinion, could its decisions ideally be? Could we not begin from here, from the shores of the Indian Ocean, the movement toward a nuclear-free world of the year 2000, the aim proclaimed by the Delhi Declaration?

[Gandhi] The Indian Ocean has already been declared a zone of peace by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the conference which should have taken place on this issue has not taken place yet. It has been blocked by certain powers. We feel that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace free from nuclear weapons. There should be no pressure exerted here, including military pressure, on the states in the region. But the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is only one part of the world. We must look to the whole world as a zone of peace.

[Question by unidentified correspondent, in vernacular with superimposed Russian translation] My question concerns your relations with China. Of late one has seen them improve, and I would like to ask, in the event of the occurrence of military conflict, of an attack from China, what stance will you adopt, and on whose side will you be?

[Gorbachev] I think that if relations improve in the Asian region -- and first and foremost among the great states and peoples, by which I mean in the first place China, India, and the Soviet Union -- then this will create a totally different situation and I think that what you are forecasting will not happen; of that I am convinced, and no one will have to choose sides. I think that the trend will be -- and this can already be felt and is gaining in strength -- that the trend will be toward the normalization and improvement of relations in the Asian region, and this includes relations between such countries as our countries -- China, India and the Soviet Union.

[Question by unidentified correspondent, in English with superimposed Russian translation] You know that this week the United States exceeded the limits of the SALT II treaty, producing a B-52 bomber capable of carrying cruise missiles. I would like to hear your opinion: What will the Soviet Union's answer be, and what effect will this have on the arms control talks?

[Gorbachev] This information has reached me through the press, But I am not yet familiar with the White House's official statements on this question. But if this is the case, if that decision has been made, then we consider this step to be one that simply contradicts the whole logic of the Reykjavik talks and even the statements made by the U.S. side after Reykjavik, that it remains committed to talks, to the quest for disarmament; and at the same time it demonstrates contempt for such an important treaty as the SALT-II treaty as well as the ABM Treaty. We believe that if this decision has been made it is a big mistake and it will make the search and the approaches to disarmament more difficult. But this is at the same time a stimulus for all those who understand the need for disarmament, for nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons. Hence we in the Soviet Union were right in addressing all people. The time now is such that everyone has to act together and to present his position to the government of the United States of America.

[Question by unidentified correspondent; in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mr General Secretary, evidently, in view of security measures that have been taken, you have not been able to get to know India now. Your movements were limited even in Delhi. I would like you to share your thoughts on the problem of terrorism and its consequences.

[Gorbachev] My movements in Delhi were completely in accordance with the program which we had worked out. Our purpose during this visit was to ensure maximum opportunities for talks and exchanges of opinions. We were aware of a great need for this. This is what we have done, and I think we did the right thing, now that we have achieved such results during the visit, and nothing else. [sentence as heard] As far as terrorism is concerned, our position of principle is known to the whole world. We are categorically opposed -- this is a point of principle in our philosophy by which we are guided in our affairs, in domestic and foreign affairs: We are categorically opposed to terrorism in any form, and particularly where terrorism takes the form of state terrorism.

[Question by unidentified correspondent; in English with superimposed Russian translation] Please allow me to call you Comrade.

[Gorbachev] Please do , if you want to.

[Correspondent] Thank you. There are three parts to my question. Comrade Gorbachev, you have expressed the hope that the Afghan problem will be solved very quickly. I would like to know what this hope is based on. Are there any new proposals? Second, you have talked about a security plan for the Indian Ocean. I would like to hear whether it is possible for Pakistan to be included in it? If so, then in what way? And third, what are your proposals for improving mutual understanding between the USSR and Pakistan? And what, in your view, is hampering the maintenance of good-neighborly and good relations?

[Gorbachev] Two words on each question. As far as our proposals on turning the Indian Ocean into a security zone are concerned, we -- that is to say our views here -- are close to the views of the Indian Government, views that have been mentioned here by the prime minister. We are willing to participate in a process that would lead to the creation of such a security situation, and that would answer the interests of all the littoral states -- and Pakistan is one of those -- and would also answer the interests of the whole community that uses the services of the Indian Ocean in the interests of development and cooperation. Your asked what is new that enables me to be optimistic about a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. I think that there is a great deal that is new, both as regards the Cordovez mission -- there is some movement toward a meeting taking place there -- and as regards, I think, the desire of other states, including the Soviet Union, for a settlement of this problem.

Perhaps I could now confine myself to those remarks because it is particularly awkward to discuss this topic in concrete terms when a search is under way and when it is already of a quite specific nature. One would not want to hinder this process. And, finally, our relations, the Soviet Union's relations with Pakistan. As is well-known, we have always cooperated with Pakistan, an even when difficult moments occurred we did our bit to remove the tension in the region. We are prepared to act in the same way now as well. But we hope that Pakistan itself will think over its position with due regard for our common interest in normalizing the situation in the region.

[Unidentified correspondent in English, superimposed by Russian translation] I have a brief question for both of you. I would like to ask about China again. You expressed the hope that India and China can settle their differences. How can that be done if China continues to occupy thousands of miles of Indian territory and helps Pakistan make the bomb. What is you stance on this question of dispute territory? Are the territories Indian or Chinese? And a question for the prime minister. In Bangkok, you told the Thai prime minister that you intended to discuss the Cambodian problem with Mr Gorbachev. Did you discuss it, and what are the results of the discussion?

[Gorbachev] You first! [laughter among audience] In a spirit of mutual assistance!

[Gandhi] We did, as a matter of fact, discuss the Cambodia problem. And on this question we did not change the position that we have adopted since the moment it first emerged. It consists in the fact that there can be no solution involving representatives of the Pol Pot regime. During my trip to Indonesia and Thailand, I reached the conclusion that these two countries adhere to the same position. We discuss the question. But it may be that further discussion will be necessary at other levels. We shall continue these discussions.

[Gorbachev] I would say this: The Cambodia problem was indeed the subject of an exchange of views, of mutual analysis, and comparing of notes, and we did in fact agree to continue the discussion of this problem. We know how the Cambodia problem emerged, and it needs to be resolved in the interests of the Cambodian people, who have suffered such great losses for reasons that are well known. As for the question on the border disputes between India and China, I think that both India and China have everything they need to investiage this dispute and find a solution that would strengthen on the basis of trust, on the basis of the realities and facts, including historial facts. I think that the right solution will be found. This is a problem that will be solved by China and India.

[Question by (?Richard Ehrlich) of the TORONTO STAR in English with superimposed Russian translation] As I understood it from the response to the question by my Arab Colleague, Afghan refugees are now leaving Afghanistan because of the Soviet presence. But after all, 4 million refugees have left Afghanistan. Why were they forced to do this? Tell us, please, which settlement of the Afghan problem you prefer and consider possible? One that the Government of Afghanistan takes and which turns out to be acceptable to the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] As you know, we still have such a situation in the world right now when more and more new people are entering the arena of independent historial creation. They are making their political choice, their social choice, they are choosing their own way. And we see this, such facts and such phenomena, on many continents of our world. How are we supposed to react to this? We think that if we do not recognize the right of every people to have a political and social choice then there cannot be normal internatonal relations. Only the people of this or that country have the right to choose which way to go, which ideologies to process and which forms of political organization to use. This is its sovereign right. And, by the way, the majority of the states you represent here have traversed this path of selection, starting with all the others. Why, then, have we recognized the right to choose on time, in some cases, and after a delay, in other cases, as, for example, the United States recognized the October Revolution after 17 years even though we recognized and supported the struggle of the American people and the results of the revolution?

We have recognized the right of the Indian people to make their choice when they announced independence and [word indistinct]. Should we, a great state, and other states really deprive other people of this right to choose? No. This is a general premise for understanding the question of why conflicts arise. Because they sometimes prevent people from implementing this lawful right of theirs.

Concerning Afghanistan, this is our neighboring state. Under all regimes we have had excellent relations with this state, and it is up to the Afghan people to decide which system to have and which regime to have in Afghanistan. We have cooperated with the kings, we cooperated with the prime ministers, and we are cooperating with the present-day Afghanistan, with the present regime which was formed on the basis of revolutionary events in this society. And what about us, have we the right, as others have done, to keep Afghanistan from making its own choice, have we the right to impart impulses to the progress of this society which has lagged considerably behind other peoples? I think we do not have the right to do this.

We came to Afghanistan, we introduced a limited contingent of troops at the invitation of the government, the government which was in existence at the time. And we shall leave Afghanistan. We cannot allow such a situation in which our troops -- and no one is thinking of this either in the Soviet leadership, or has ever thought of this -- remain in Afghanistan. We believe in the friendly people of Afghanistan. The troops appeared there at a time when the independence of the choice of the Afghan people was threatened by foreign interference. We are in favor of an Afghanistan which is nonaligned, independent, and which disposes of its own resources and everything that relates to Afghanistan in a sovereign manner. We are in favor of a neutral Afghanistan. The nature of the regime there is a matter for the Afghan people.

[Question by unidentified correspondent] I have a question for Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. Mr Prime Minister, in his Vladivostok speech Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed that a broad dialogue be started up on matters pertaining to security in Asia and the region of the Indian and Pacific Oceans. What contribution to the development of this dialogue has been made at the Soviet-Indian talks in Delhi which have come to an end? And how do you, Mr Prime Minister, evaluate this contribution? Thank you.

[Gandhi] As I mentioned in one of my speeches the idea of cooperation in Asia in the name of peace is not new. It was put forward by Jawaharlal Nehru almost 40 years ago, even before India obtained independence. I have always felt that for us to have true peace it is necessary for the level of international relations, not only India's relations but relations between other countries, to become more significant than the level of pragmatism. This can only happen if great mutual understanding is achieved between countries. And Asia is just the region where this could be done.

[Gorbachev] Good-bye.

PRAVDA Version

PM292041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 2

["Joint Press Conference by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Gandhi" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] New Delhi November 29 (TASS) -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of the Republic of India held a joint news conference here yesterday.

Opening it, Rajiv Gahdhi said:

Mr General Secretary,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Friends,

I feel that this visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to India has been a major landmark in our bilateral relations. It has reaffirmed the strong friendship between our countries.

We had broad discussions. They lasted probably 10 hours. Our one-to-one meetings were held in an atmosphere of warmth and trust. There were simultaneous discussions at the level of ministers and other delegation members. The results of the visit are of great importance for bilateral relations, for stability in the region, and -- perhaps the most important -- for peace all over the world.

During the visit we discussed many spheres where we have common interests, particularly those like peace, nuclear disarmament, and development. The General Secretary and I signed on 27 November a number of documents. Perhaps the most important among them is the Delhi Declaration. It contains the principles of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

We signed an agreement of economic and technical cooperation, a new consular convention, and a protocol on holding festivals in each other's countries. A joint statement on the visit's results was released.

These agreements testify to the strength, maturity, stability, and dynamism that are typical of Indo-Soviet friendship.

The Delhi Declaration is a document on an historic scale. Its international significance will grow more and more with the passage of time. It contains the principles of international relations based on freedom, equality, and nonviolence, and makes a major contribution to a positive world process which will be distinguished by cooperation and peace.

We signed the most important economic agreement in the history of our relations, which covers a number of new projects, including projects in coal and oil. This agreement has two new features: local financing and commissioning on a "turnkey" basis.

We also agreed that our trade should increase by 2.5 times by 1992. We will study new areas and new forms of economic cooperation. Our minister of finance and V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, will hold further discussions on this question.

We also decided to impart a qualitative acceleration to our cooperation in the sphere of science and technology. We will, perhaps, approach this sphere in a completely new fashion. Joint research is planned in advanced technology, after which we intend to move on to the joint assimilation of these technologies. The General Secretary agreed to our suggestion that a delegation headed by G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, be sent to India to examine all these aspects on the spot. Afterwards, on the basis of the results of its work, we will take further steps.

This visit gives a sense of enormous gratification. I hope that it will signify a major upturn in the level of Indo-Soviet relations.

And now I would like to give the floor to General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev. This was his first visit to India. Unfortunately, however, he was unable to see more of our country. We hope that M.S. Gorbachev will visit us again and will have a chance to see more of India.

M.S. Gorbachev: Esteemed Mr Prime Minister;
Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen,
Comrades and Friends,

I must say that you, Mr Prime Minister, have made my task both easier and more difficult. You have already said the main thing. I could limit myself to just a few remarks, even a few words, by saying that I fully agree with you. But I think our colleagues for this meeting -- the newsmen -- would not be satisfied with this.

I would like to tell you first about the atmosphere of this visit. It has been good, friendly and sincere. The conversations have been in a spirit of candor and profound mutual understanding. This has enabled us to discuss a wide range of problems, which are of interest both to the Soviet Union and to India.

This visit has been a landmark in long-standing and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and India. It would seem that this is all clear and there has been nothing out of the ordinary, for our ties have been constant and ever deepening.

But this visit has had its peculiarities and I would like to mention them. These peculiarities are connected, first of all, with the domestic development of our countries. Both the Soviet Union and India have entered a period in their historical development where they have set themselves major goals, major tasks. Naturally enough, this makes different demands also on our cooperation. We should take account of each other's concerns, as is customary with friends, and we are long-standing friends and partners.

From the standpoint of our countries' domestic development, there has been also another peculiarity: There has been a change of leadership in both the Soviet Union and India. Mr Prime Minister and I have a common opinion: We see our task not only in preserving what was created in our relations by the preceding generations but also in trying to make our own contribution, advancing our relations further, deepening them and reaching new forms of cooperation.

This visit has had yet another peculiarity which has been connected with the current international situation. We have expressed our opinions and judgements about it over thse days and you know them. The world situation is of a kind that makes it essential for such a powerful factor of tremendous international significance as Soviet-Indian cooperation to assume an even greater role in the world.

We have felt our responsibility these days not only to our peoples but also to the peoples of all countries and to the whole world for the policy we have been pursuing and the further steps we shall be taking either in cooperation or independently, just as it has been so far, in the interest of strengthening peace and averting nuclear war.

I think that the pecularities I just mentioned make it possible to understand why the visit has been planned in this way and how it has passed.

We have mostly spent these days in conversations. We have had no chance to tour India and I think this is a shortcoming which ought to be overcome in the future. Life is marching on, cooperation is broadening and contacts are getting closer. Our relations will keep growing more dynamic and there will be more meetings.

I agree with the prime minister that this visit has been distinguished by an extremely busy program of meetings and conversations. The talks have involved the full complements of the two delegations, their members conducting them separately, each with his own partners, within their specific areas of responsibility.

We have worked hard with the prime minister and now that the visit is drawing to a close and we are summing up the results, I think that our efforts have not been wasted.

We have indeed spent many hours just between the two of us and this has enabled us to take a careful look at all areas of our cooperation and all issues related both to our bilateral relations and to international and regional problems. It has been a real, substantive dialogue which has covered the most fundamental questions of world development and bilateral ties between our countries.

Let me say once more: An immense, vast amount of work has been done. I agree with the prime minister that this enabled us to reach important accords both in politics, in economic, scientific and technological links and in the cultural field.

The main result of the visit is that it has made it possible, I would say, to build up the potential of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India.

During this visit we have felt both the significance of Soviet-Indian relations today and our responsibility to our peoples and to the entire world. Their significance stems, above all, from the fact that they are relations beteen states with different social systems, with different histories, and with a wide variety of national and spiritual traditions all of their own. It is the decades of mutually advantageous and straightforward cooperation that have created this major, distinctive phenomenon of the times, which has become an important factor in international politics.

Today's relations between India and the Soviet Union are the fullest embodiment of the principles of peaceful co-existence. For this reason alone, they deserve careful attention.

As far as we, the leaders of these countries, are concerned, our task is to make certain that their relations at this new stage in world history be in even fuller accord with the principles of peaceful co-existence. Of course, these should be applied to practice. It is not enough to abide by political principles, it is important to demonstrate them in practical action. We are proud of this stand. And why shouldn't we? There are politicans that find other, very dubious reasons to plume themselves on. We have every reason to be proud of the policy of peaceful coexistence. But this also means to feel responsibility.

The high level of our relations has made it possible to issue such a document as the "declaration on principles for a nuclear weapon-free and non-violent world". I fully agree with the wide-ranging and convincing arguments given here by Mr. Gandhi when revealing the meaning of this important political document. It is a truly extraordinary document indeed, a document of great international significance. It reflects the role of the Soviet Union and India in world affairs and their moral right to make such an address to all mankind.

Yes, we are convinced that we have had the moral right to issue such a document as the declaration. It encapsulates a point of view, ours and India's, on the most vital problems of the present-day world. This document gives the world community a possibility to see the thrust of our thoughts, our real intentions and goals.

A joint statement has been issued on the visit's results. It is also unusual for its wide coverage of problems and for the similarity it shows of two countries' views and approaches to the pressing issues of international politics.

An agreement on economic and technological cooperation has been signed. I would like to repeat here what Mr. Prime Minister has said: This is the largest agreement in this field in the entire history of our relations.

A protocol on festivals in India and in the Soviet Union has been signed. These will be devoted to two memorable dates in the histories of our countries: the 70th anniversary of the great October revolution and the 40th anniversary of India's independence. Their scope and contents will correspond to the significance of these events. I trust that this will bring our peoples even closer together.

Speaking of the documents signed as a result of this visit, it is important to point out the following: Despite the richness of their contents, what has emerged in the process of the talks themselves goes far beyond the bounds of these documents and holds a promise of even more tangible results for both our countries.

It goes without saying that the measures so large in their scale to deepen interaction mean heavy workloads on everybody who will be involved in their practical implementation. But I am positive of unprejudicedness and the mutual desire to take account of each other's interests, help each other and cooperate, everything that has been projected and contemplated here, in New Delhi, can and, I would like to add at once, must be carried out. At any rate, the prime minister and I are deeply committed to this goal.

I have been very impressed by the way the Soviet Union's envoys have been received in the parliament of India. This has been a remarkable act, which will remain in the history of our two countries.

We have had an opportunity to meet with public figures -- members of the friendship society and the society for cultural relations with the USSR. In order to greet the delegations from the Soviet Union, they have come from all parts of India, from different states -- well-known, respected, honored people. Through their emotional, friendly words, they have sought to convey to us the profound feelings of friendship and sympathy entertained by the Indian people towards the Soviet Union, to our people. It has been a moving, memorable meeting and we shall carry the feelings expressed there to our people.

Taking this opportunity, I would like to thank the citizens of India and all organizations that have contributed to the visit's success -- for the warmth and consideration which have surrounded us all these days, for the generosity with which the Indians have shared with us their ideas and concerns.

Here, in India, my comrades and I could not but feel how close and consonant the spirit aspirations of our peoples are. Our countries both have had a difficult history. There have been many bitter pages both in the history of India and in the history of my country. This is perhaps why the compassion for another's pain, the desire for justice and the will for peace and freedom are so strong in the Soviet and Indian peoples.

Returning to the contents of the talks during this visit, I would like to say that there has not been a single meeting that has not focused on the most urgent issues of international life. Mr Gandhi and I are unanimous that the Soviet Union and India consider it the task of tasks to deliver the world from nuclear weapons. Overcome tension, and cool the hot spots of the world. All this has been among the problems we have talked about.

We believe that this cannot be done, cannot be achieved through confrontation and enmity, through an absurd buildup of strength. The position of strength, and I have already said this once, is meant to bend others' will, infringe upon others' interests or even suppress the undesirables.

We are deeply convinced that this position has no future, while its present day is most unenviable or even disgraceful.

The routes to the future lie through affirming new political thinking, through understanding the realities of the nuclear and space age, through realizing the interdependence of all countries, and through becoming convinced that the building of peace and reliable security should involve all countries, all peoples, all states.

In conclusion, I would like to say that both in Moscow before this visit and here, in New Delhi, I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters from Indian organizations and citizens. They have been permeated with heartfelt feelings of affection for the Soviet Union, for our people. There have been many invitations to visit many places in India. I thank with all my heart the Indian citizens, public organizations and press for the warm words, good wishes and feelings of affection for my country.

I would like to convey special words of greeting and gratitude to the Indian youth, young students and pupils, whom I have only seen this time, alas, from my car. I appreciate the feelings they have shown to our delegations and to the Soviet people in general these days.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi answered questions from journalists.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. You have just said that regional problems were discussed in the talks. What is your view of the militarization of Pakistan by the United States?

Answer. We all -- the Soviet Union, Indian, and Pakistan -- are neighbors. I think that neighbors should always live in peace and help one another to build their relations with the Pakistani people. Approaches should be worked out to achieve such relations. Other ways lead to unpredictable consequences and we should all remember this. I think that this fully applies to the Pakistani Government.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. There was voiced in the parliament address the idea of broadening cooperation between the USSR and India in the peaceful uses of space and establishing an international center to train cosmonauts. Do you think this idea feasible?

Answer. I think it's a very good idea. But we'll have to go into more details to see exactly how it can be implemented. I think that it is feasible.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. You seek improvement of relations with China and spoke of this in Vladivostok, and we wish you success in this. I would like to ask you a question which is of interest to our country's peoples: Given a normalization of relations with China, is there a danger of military or other pressure on our country, bearing in mind the long-standing border disputes? You are aware of certain steps taken recently by China, which constitute a retreat from its former positions. What could be done to ensure that this does not happen and that, at the same time, relations between the USSR and India do not go "sour?"

Answer. As for the lastest wish, I have already commented on it. What we are doing to improve relations with China will not detract from our relations with India. Our steps in that field will never harm her. We will expand our relations with India and the current visit to proof of it.

As for the rest of your speech (laughter), I can say that the better relations in the Asian region between all the countries and the better relations between the USSR and China, the better the overall atmosphere in that part of the world. When the atmosphere improves and cooperation broadens, understanding will grow and there will be more trust.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. Making statements these last days and at the press conference today, you characterised the latest achievements of the scientific and technological revolution as a new promising area of Indian-Soviet cooperation. The space center has already been discussed here. In what other areas and new forms can this cooperation develop in your view?

Answer. I think that these questions will be discussed in greater detail by our scientists and a Soviet delegation headed by Academician Marchuk.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. How do you view China's invasion along our northern borders?

Answer. I could limit myself to what I have already said. I think that both sides have the desire to solve border questions in a spirit of mutual understanding, on the basis of political settlement. This is a very correct approach and we, for our part, welcome it.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. You are aware that there are 5 million Afghan refugees in Iran, Pakistan, and India. Here, in Delhi, you have signed the Delhi Declaration. Do you think that the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan will enable the Afghan refugees to return home?

Answer. This problem has already been covered in my interview to the Indian journalists. We stand for a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. The sooner accord is reached on precisely such an approach to the problem, the better for Afghanistan and its neighbors. This also holds true for the problem of refugees. I will only take an issue with your view that it is linked to the withdrawal of Soviet troops. We are committed to a political settlements, we'll take an active stand on it and invite every party involved in the problem to participate and cooperate. I want to say anew that there are prospects for the settlement of this problem in the not too distant future. This is our view of the situation and we will act proceeding from this view.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. The Indian Ocean is being militarized. Symptomatically, there are no littoral nuclear powers and all weapons have been introduced from outside. A conference on the establishment of a peace zone in the Indian Ocean is scheduled to convene shortly. What resolutions could it pass?

Answer. The Indian Ocean has already been declared a zone of peace by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the conference which should have taken place has not taken place yet and we feel that it is being locked by certain nuclear powers which are interested in this. The Indian Ocean must be a region of peace, free from rivalries between nuclear powers, and here there must be no pressure at all, including military pressure, on small and littoral states. But the Indian Ocean is just one part of the whole world. We would like to see the entire planet a zone of peace.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. My question concerned your relations with China. They have started to improve recently. And if a military confrontation against India is created by China, whose side will you take?

Answer. If relations in the Asian region as a whole and between the great powers in Asia, which I think primarily are China, India and the Soviet Union, keep improving, a very difficult situation will emerge and your forecasts will never come true. It is my conviction. And no one will have to take someone's side. I think that the tendency I am talking about will gain momentum, the tendency for normalization and better relations in Asia, including relations between such countries as China, India and the Soviet Union.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. A few days ago the United States made the decision to renounce the SALT II Treaty by deploying a B-52 bomber armed with cruise missiles. What will be the Soviet Union's response and what effect will this have on the current arms control talks?

Answer: I learned the news you talk about from the press. I have not yet read the official White House statement. This decision, if it has really been taken, is contrary to the entire logic of the talks in Reykjavik and even to the statements made by the American side since Reykjavik that it remains committed to disarmament talks. At the same time, it demonstrates its disregard for such an important document as SALT-II along with the ABM Treaty. We think that if such a decision is taken, it will be a bad error. It will complicate the search for and approaches to disarmament.

I would like to add also that these actions should add to the energy of all those who realize the need for disarmament and the abolition of nuclear weapons. They show anew that we in the Soviet Union are right in appealing to all the peoples to act and act together before it is too late.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. What can be done for a political solution in Afghanistan? Our prime minister described you yesterday as personifying innovation and daring. Do you think a small nonaligned group would help in a radical solution of the Afghanistan problem?

Answer. Everything that can contribute to a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan merits attention. I have already answered to questions like the one just asked and can hardly add anything. But I understand the worry in your question.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. Mr General Secretary, apparently it was because of security considerations that you could not see so much of India this time. In this context, what could say about terrorism and its implications?

Answer. My movemens in New Delhi were fully in accord with the program drawn up by us. The purpose of the visit was to use every opportunity for talks and exchanges of views. We felt a need for them and proceeded from it and and I think we did right to shape up the visit in this way.

As for terrorism, our position of principle is known to the whole world: We are absolutely against it. It is a position of principle and we take guidance from it in our domestic and external affairs.

I repeat, we are resolutely opposed to terrorism in any form, especially state terrorism.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. You have expressed the hope for an early settlement of the Afghanistan problem. I would like to know on what this hope is based. You spoke of a security plan for the Indian Ocean. What is your opinion about including Pakistan in this, and how do you see this taking place? How do you perceive the improvement of mutual relations between the USSR and Pakistan and what was it, in your opinion, that hindered the maintenance of goodneighborly relations?

Answer. As for our proposals on establishing a zone of peace and security in the Indian Ocean, they are close to the views of the Indian Government presented here by Mr. Prime Minister.

We are ready to participate in a process which would lead to security for all the littoral states, including Pakistan. This would meet the interests of the entire Indian Ocean community, the interests of development and cooperation.

As for the sources of our optimism about the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, I think there are new developments both in the Cordovez mission and in the striving of other states, including the Soviet Union, to have this problem settled. I will draw the line at this remark because this subject should not be discussed in public when the process of search is under way. It may interfere.

Lastly, relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan. We are known to have always cooperated with Pakistan and made our contribution even in difficult times to lessen tension in that point of Asia. We are ready to act in the manner today as well. We hope that Pakistan, too, will think over its position with a view to general interest in the normalization of the situation in the region.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. You have expressed hope that India and China can normalize relations. How can this be done when China continues to sit on thousands of square miles of Indian territory and helps Pakistan make things difficult for us? What is your position on the disputed territory? You said in Bandung that you would discuss the Cambodian problem with Mr Gorbachev. Have you done it and with what results?

Answer. We did talk about the Cambodian problem. The basic problem is -- and in this we have not changed our position right from the beginning -- and that is that there can be no solution that involves anyone from the old Pol Pot regime. During my visits to Indonesia and Thailand I thought that a similar view was also held by those countries. We have discussed this and, perhaps, it will require much longer discussions at a different level and we will try and continue that exercise.

Mikhail Gorbachev: The problem of Cambodian indeed was a subject of exchanges of views, joint analysis and note-comparing. We agreed to continue the discussion. Everyone knows how the Cambodian problem arose and it has to be resolved in the interests of the Cambodian people, who sustained bad losses because of well-known causes.

As for border disputes between India and China, I think that both countries have everything it takes to resolve them on the basis of trust and realities. I think a correct solution will be found. This problem will be tackled by China and India.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. Twenty years ago at Tashkent your country made efforts to bring India and Pakistan together. What are the chances of your playing a role in trying to bring India and China together? Was this question raised in the talks with China or would you like to raise it yourself so that there can be qualitative improvement in the situation in this part of the world?

Answer. There are contacts between India and China and they are being used to clarify all the problems of mutual interest.

Question to Mikhail Gorbachev. You said that Afghan refugees did not leave Afghanistan because of the Soviet presence. What settlement do you prefer and do you consider the proposals of the Afghan Government realistic? And are the Soviet troops essentially trapped in Afghanistan by the Mujaheddin?

Answer. In today's world situation ever new peoples are emerging onto the scene as independent history-makers. They are making political and social choices and deciding what road to follow. We find this in different parts of the world.

What attitude should be taken to this phenomenon? We think that if we deny the right of choice to people, there can be no normal international relations. Only the people of one country or another have the right to decide what road to follow, what ideology to profess and what forms of political organization to use. It is their sovereign right. Most of the states made this choice, the one you represent here (Canada), the U.S., the Soviet Union and India. Why then the right of choice is recognized in one case and is not, or is recognised belatedly, in another? The United States, for instance, recognised the Soviet Union 17 years late though Russia had recognized American independence from the start. Naturally, the USSR recognised the right of the Indian people to make their choice when they had proclaimed independence.

Can the right to choose be denied to anyone? This is the general premise in the understanding of the causes of conflicts. They arise when the initiative of the people to exercise their lawful right is blocked from outside.

Afghanistan is our neighbor. We have had excellent relations with it under all the regimes. We cooperated with kings and prime ministers and are cooperating with today's Afghanistan, which rose from revolutionary developments in that country. It is up to the Afghan people to decide what system to have, to make their choice and to give an impetus to the development of their society, which is considerably behind others.

We sent a limited troop contingent to Afghanistan at the invitation of its government when the independent choice of the Afghan people had been jeopardized by foreign intervention. And we will leave Afghanistan. It is farthest from the thoughts of the Soviet leadership to have Soviet troops stay in Afghanistan. We believe in the friendly people of Afghanistan.

We stand for a nonaligned, independent, sovereign Afghanistan which would be the master of its resources and everything that belongs to it, for a neutral Afghanistan. What kind of regime will be there is up to the Afghan people.

Question to Rajiv Gandhi. Mikhail Gorbachev suggested in his Vladivostok speech a broad dialogue on security in Asia, the Indian and the Pacific Ocean. What contribution was made to this dialogue by the Soviet-Indian talks in New Delhi?

Answer: As I mentioned in one of my speeches, the idea of Asian cooperation for peace is not new. It was put forward by Jawaharlal Nehru almost 40 years ago. I have always felt that for there to be true peace we need the level of international relations -- not only India's relations with other states, but relations among all the countries of the region -- to become more meaningful and far removed from simple pragmatism. And this can happen only if more understanding is reached among countries. India is prepared to propose itself as the place where this can begin.

The press conference is over, thank you.

Delhi TV Version

BK280900 Delhi Doordarshan Television Network in English 0425 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Joint press conference held by Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in New Delhi; Gorbachev's answers in Russian with simultaneous translation into English -- live]

[Text] [Gandhi] General Secretary, ladies and gentlemen, friends: -- I feel that this visit of General Secretary Gorbachev to India has been a major landmark in our bilateral relations. It has reaffirmed the strong friendship between our two countries. We have had very wide ranging discussions, very intensive discussions -- almost, I think if I am right, 10 hours between just the two of us -- and I feel that they have been very fruitful. They have been held in an atmosphere of warmth, of confidence, and of trust. Other talks have been going on at various other levels, at mimisterial levels and other levels, between the two delegations. The outcome of this visit will be significant for our bilateral ties, for regional stability and perhaps most for world peace.

During this visit we have talked about many areas where we have common interest, more especially peace, nuclear disarmament, development. We have signed a number of agreements during this visit, perhaps the most important is the Delhi Declaration that the two of us signed yesterday. It lays our principles for a nuclear weapon-free world, a nonviolent world. We have signed agreements on economic, scientific and technological cooperation. We have signed a consular convention, a protocol on holding festivals in each other's country and, at the end of this visit, a joint statement will be issued. These agreements are a testimony to the strength, maturity, stability and resilience and the dynamism that Indo-Soviet friendship has come to mean. The Delhi Declaration is a historic document and its international significance will only be seen in time. It embodies a comprehensive new framework for international relations based on freedom, equality, justice and nonviolence. It will be a major contribution to cooperative and peaceful world order.

The economic agreement that we have signed is the largest that we have signed between our two countries. It covers new projects: Tehri, Bokaro, the coking coal, oil. There are two new elements in the economic agreement, the local cost financing and, for the first time, a turn-key approach. Of course, wherever these will be desirable, we will use them.

We have also agreed to increase our trade by about two and a half times by 1992. We will be looking at a new areas, new vistas, new modes of economic cooperation. Our finance minister and the Soviet deputy premier, Kamentsev, will be talking about these further. We have also decided to give a qualitative thrust to our science and technology cooperation, in reinvigorating, revamping our relationships, perhaps doing certain research projects in frontier technology areas together and then from moving from that stage to the production stage of those technologies. We have invited Academician Marchuk to come to India and the general secretary has agreed to send a delegation led by Academician Marchuk who will go into all these aspects and we will follow from there. Lastly, let me say once again that this visit has been very satisfying and very heart warming for us. I hope that this major increase in the level of our relationship will be just one more step in Indo-Soviet relations. I now call upon General Secretary Gorbachev to speak to you. This is his first visit to India. Unfortunately he has not been able to see very much of India, and we look forward to invite him back to see a little bit more of our country. General Secretary Gorbachev.

[Gorbachev] Distinguished Mr prime minister, dinstinguished ladies and gentlemen, comrades, friends! Let me say, Mr prime minister, that you have both made my task more difficult and easier at the same time. You have already discussed the major points and I could limit myself to merely few remarks, to few words, by saying that I fully agree with what you said. However, I believe that our colleagues at this meeting, journalists, will not be satisfied.

Let me first say some words about the atmosphere of this visit. The atmosphere was good. It was friendly. It was sincere. Our exchanges were frank. We understood each other very well and profoundly and this enabled us to discuss a wide-range of issues, a wide-range of problems of mutual interest to the Soviet Union and also to India. Our visit is one of the milestones along the path of a long and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and India. I believe everything is clear in this respect. There is nothing unusual. This is further testimony of our ever increasing and expanding contacts. However, at the same time, there are some specific and distinguishing features. Those features are above all due to the internal developments in our countries. Both the Soviet Union and India have entered a stage of their thorough development where they have set themselves major tasks and major goals. It is quite natural that this also sets different standards for our cooperation and we must take them into account. We must take into account each other's concerns, as is common among friends, and we are old, long-time partners and friends.

There is also another specific feature inherent in this visit from the point of view of internal developments in our countries: The leadership has changed in the Soviet Union and in India.

We have come to share the views with lthe prime minister, that we believe that our task is not only to preserve what has already been built in our relations by the preceding generations, but also to try to make our own contributions by advancing our relations further and deepening them, to develop new forms of cooperation. There is also another characteristic feature of the visit namely the international situation, that surrounds this visit, in which this visit is taking place. I think that these days we have expressed our views and opinions to the prime minister. You are aware of those views and opinions and we understand that the situation in the world is such that it requires, that the major factor, namely the Soviet-Indian cooperation [sentence as heard]. This is a powerful factor in terms of its international weight. But this factor acquires a new dimension and a new importance in the world. These days we were aware of our responsibility, not only to our people and nations, but also to the nations of all the countries, indeed to the entire world for the policy which we pursue, which is ours, and for the steps which we will, either independently or on the basis of commonality, take in the future in order to prevent the threat of nuclear war and to strengthen peace.

I think that these characteristic features which I have just outlined, in a few words, enable you to understand just why the visit was structured in the way it was structured. Basically, we spent these days holding discussions. We have not had an opportunity this time, and I think this is a major drawback which has to be rectified in the future, to visit India, to see other places in India.

Life goes on, cooperation is expanding, contacts will become deeper and our relations will become more dynamic, there will be more, a great number of meetings and I believe that we will have an opportunity, and I will avail myself of the words that have already been spoken by the prime minister in order to see some more of India during my next visit.

I agree with the prime minister in the sense that the characteristic feature of the visit was the fact that there has been a great number of discussions and meetings. Negotiations were conducted in the plenary, and the individual members of our delegation also held their negotiations with their counterparts within their purview. We have done much. We have worked extensively with the prime minister and now that the visit is drawing to a close and we are summing up the results of this visit, I believe that our efforts were not in vain.

It is true that we spent many hours together tete-a-tete, one on one, and this made it possible for us to very carefully consider, to discuss, all the spheres of our cooperation and indeed all the issues pertaining to our bilateral relations as well as to international, regional issues and this was a real wide-ranging dialogue which covered the most important and major questions of international relations and of our bilateral affairs. Let me repeat that a great amount of work has been done, a large-scale and wide-ranging work and we agreed with the prime minister that this work enabled us to advance our political dialogue very far and to reach very important agreements both in political, economic, scientific, and technical and cultural areas and contacts.

If I were to outline the main results of the visit, I would say that it made it possible to build upon the potential of friendship and cooperation between India and the Soviet Union. Because of the visit we have felt once again both the significance which Soviet-Indian relations have nowadays, and our responsibility to our peoples and to the entire world.

And perhaps this significance flows primarily from the fact that what is involved, our relations between states that belong to different social systems -- they have different histories of their own. They have different and rich cultural and spiritual traditions. Decades of fair and mutually advantageous cooperation are a major and very special phenomenon of present day life that has become an important factor in international affairs.

I want to be modest and I do not want to put the prime minister in an awkward situation. I would not like to put Mr Rajiv Gandhi in an awkward situation. However, let me say this. Perhaps in the framework of the relations between India and the Soviet Union today the principles of peaceful coexistence have, perhaps, found their fullest embodiment and they deserve attention if for no other reason than the one I have just outlined. As for us, the leaders of those two countries, our task is indeed to see to it that at the new stage in historical development those relations are in consistency with these new principles -- new principles which I believe we all share. How we implement them in practice is something different. However, what is involved here is not only commitment, I mean the political declaration, but also practical commitment. We take pride from it. Why would not we be proud of it? But there are politicians who find other pretexts, dubious and doubtful pretexts, to take pride in something, to become proud of something. There are fundamental, call it good reasons, to be proud of it, but it also means to take responsibility.

The high level of our relations made it possible to develop a document, I mean the declaration on the principles of nuclear weapon-free and nonviolent world. We signed this declaration yesterday with the distinguished prime minister and I fully agree with the extensive and convincing arguments that Mr Rajiv Gandhi adduced here in talking about the content of that document. Indeed this is a unique, extraordinary document, a document of great international significance. It reflects the role played by the Soviet Union and India in international affairs: their moral right to make such an appeal addressed to the humanity as a whole. Yes we are convinced that we do have, we did have, the moral right to sign the document, which was the declaration. The declaration reflects our and Indian standpoint regarding the most vital problems of present day world.

International community can see the basis of this document, the thrust of our reasoning, our thought, our real goal and intentions. Yesterday, the joint statement was also signed. This is also a unique document, an unusual document in terms of the scope of its problems and in terms of the commonality of approach with a view to urgent problems of international politics on the part of the two sides.

An agreement on economic and technical cooperation was signed. I should like to repeat here what Mr Prime Minister said. This is the largest agreement in the history of our relations in this area. A protocol regarding the festivals in India and in the Soviet Union was signed, the festivals to commemorate two anniversaries in the history of our states: the 70th anniversary of our revolution and 40th anniversary of independent India. The content and scale of those festivals reflect the importance and the purpose of those manifestations and I think that this will bring our people yet closer together. And yet, speaking about the document signed as a result of the visit, I must note the following in spite of the richness of the wealth of their content. What emerged in the course of negotiations transcend the framework of these documents and goes much beyond the framework and promises yet greater results for the benefit of our two countries. Naturally, such major measures to deepen [word indistinct] cooperation imply great work for all those who are to implement all those documents in practice.

However, I am convinced that since there is a political will, since there is trust, since there is an atmosphere which is not biased, and there is an intention and desire to take into consideration each other's interests, to help each other, to assist each other and to cooperate, all that has been laid down, all that has been planned and scheduled here in Delhi can -- and I wish to say right away -- must be implemented in practice. At least, Mr Prime Minister and myself are deeply committed to that goal.

I have been greatly impressed by the (?way) our Soviet envoys were received in Delhi, in India. I wish to say that by quoting the meeting in Parliament, this is an important and significant act which will go down into the history of our relations. We have had an occasion to meet public figures, members of the friendship society, association of cultural relations in India. They came from different states and different regions of India to welcome us. These are eminent, well-known and highly respected people. The words they have said are highly emotional and solemn words reflecting their desire to bring across to us the deep feelings of sympathy and friendship of the Indian people to the Soviet Union, to our nation, and these were highly exciting and thrilling meetings, and we will bring those feelings to our people.

I would like to avail myself of the opportunity to thank the citizens of India, all the organizations that contributed to the success of this visit, to thank them for their warmth and attention that was surrounding us these days, for the generosity of the Indians with which they told us about their concerns and intentions. Here in India both my comrades and myself could not fail to feel how close the spiritual intentions and trust of our people are to each other. Our countries have had a difficult history. There have been many difficult stages, both in the history of India and in the history of our country. Perhaps, this is the reason why in the Soviet Union, and in the people of the Soviet Union and the people of India, are so strong the empathy, sympathy with the pain of other person, the desire to achieve peace, justice and freedom.

Now, returning back to the content of the negotiations that have been held during the visit, let me say that there has been not a single meeting which did not focus on the most urgent issues of international affairs. Mr Gandhi and myself see eye to eye in our belief that the Soviet Union and India believe that the priority task, the task of tasks, is to rid humanity and the world of nuclear weapons to ease tensions, to reduce the temperature in different hotbeds around the globe. And all this constituted the problems that were discussed in the course of our meetings and exchanges. We believe that this can be done, this can be achieved not along the path of confrontation and enmity, not on the path of absurd buildup of power. The position of strength, as I said yesterday, is supposed to subordinate the will of the other, to impinge upon the interest of the others and even on crushing the others, those whom one is not happy with, but we are deeply convinced that this position is a non-starter and its presence is shameful and unseemly.

The road which leads to the future lies through new political thinking, through affirmation of this new thinking through the understanding of new realities, through growing awareness of the interdependence of all countries, through the strong belief that in the building of peace and global security, all nations, all countries must participate actively.

In conclusion, let me say that even in Moscow prior to the visit I received hundreds of letters, telegrams from Indian citizens and Indian organizations. These letters contained and expressed feelings of warm sympathy with our country and the Soviet people. There have been many invitations to go to India, as I said, I promise I will visit many places in India next time. From the bottom of my heart I thank the Indian citizens, public organizations, mass media for the warm words, for the kind wishes, for the feelings of sympathy with the Soviet Union and its people.

Let me especially convey my thanks and best wishes for the feelings that have been expressed, the feelings of friendship expressed by students, the youngsters whom I saw -- all of them from my motor car. Regrettably, but I am sure we will have a meeting in the future, I should like them to know that I greatly appreciate the feelings which they have shown to our delegations, to our people, to the Soviet Union these days during our visit. Thank you.

[Question] [Words indistinct] stated just now have been wideranging and intensive. Earlier we were told that considerable time was spent on discussions on regional issues. Would you like to be specific at this stage in regard to your view on what in India is seen as increased militarization of Pakistan by the United States. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] All of us -- the Soviet Union, India and Pakistan -- are neighbors and I think that neighbors must live in friendship, helping each other and build their relations in a spirit of mutual understanding. I think that when I say this I am also reporting the position of India. We are favor of good relations with the people of Pakistan and we should find ways to achieve such relations. Any other way would lead to unpredictable consequences. We should all remember this. I am sure that this should be true also of the Government of Pakistan.

[Question in Russian with simultaneous English translation] Mr Prime Minister. In his statement in Parliament Mikhail Gorbachev proposed as a way to expand cooperation in the peaceful outer space to establish in India and international center for the training of cosmonauts and with a facility to launch spacecraft. Is this feasible? What do you think?

[Gandhi] I think it is a very good idea, but we will have to go into more details to see exactly how it can be implemented. We have not gone into those details yeat, but I am sure we will.

[Question] This is Rangarajan representing ANDHRA JYOTI, a Telugu daily from Hyderabad. Your excellency has made a big overture for improving relations with China at your speech at Vladivostok. We wish you well in this effort, but I want to ask you a question which is of some concern to people in this country. That is, as you try to normalize your relations with China, there could be a possibility of military and other pressures being stepped up on our country which also has got a very long-drawn border dispute. The secretary general must have been aware of certain recent steps taken by China which constitute a throw-back on the position they had already taken. How Mr secretary general would see to it that this kind of a cynical exploitation does not take place and also an effort made by somebody else to make the milk of Indo-Soviet friendship sour?

[Gorbachev] So far as the last suggestion, I said already...I have spoken about this...that what we are doing in improving our relations with China will not weaken our relations with India. Those steps will never be detrimental to India, to the contrary, we will expand our relations with India and I think evidence to this is the current visit. As for the remaining portion of your suggestions, of your discourse, I hope that the better our relations are with all countries in the Asian and Pacific region and the better our relations are with China, between the Soviet Union and China, the better the overall atmosphere will be in the entire region and when the atmosphere improves, when the mutual understanding and cooperation expands, when a greater trust emerges, I think this will also have an impact on the policies of all countries and I am saying this with respect to the Soviet Union. I hope that I...I believe that India of course will act very responsibly in this situation. We have great experience in relations with India, and I hope, I think, I have no doubt that the Chinese Government will also act responsibly.

[Question in Russian with simultaneous English translation] Ovchinnikov of the Soviet newspaper PRAVDA. The question is for the prime minister. When you spoke over these days and today you said that technologies, the advances of the scientific and technological revolution is a new and promising area of Indo-Soviet cooperation. There has already been a question about space center. What other areas and what new forms do you wish this cooperation may take and how it will develop?

[Gandhi] Like I said in my earlier remarks, we discussed very wideranging topics on which this could take place, but we thought it was more prudent to let those who know a little bit more about technical and scientific subjects like Academician Marchuk and our own scientists to go into it in much more detail, then we will come out with specific areas of cooperation.

[Question] Mr Nayanan from INDIA TODAY. Mr general secretary, how do you view the Chinese intrusion into Sumdorong Chu on our northeastern border and what is the Soviet stand on it?

[Gorbachev] Well, I could confine myself to what I have said already. I think that both sides have the desire in the question of borders that both sides have between them, have the desire to resolve these questions in a spirit of mutual understanding on the basis of a political settlement, and I think this is the very appropriate approach. I would welcome this.

[Sharada Prasad] (Niktor) Friend from Arab World.

[Reporter] Mr Secretary General, there are 5 million.

[Sharada Prasad] Name please.

[Question] [Mohammad Arzaqi of the SAUDI GAZETTE] Mr Secretary General, there are 5 million Afghani refugees in Iran, Pakistan and some of them are in Delhi. Now you have signed the Delhi Declaration on human rights, when do you think the Soviet troops are going to withdraw from Afghanistan to allow the Afghan refugees to return home? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I have already responded to your question in my interview to Indian reporters. I've spoken at length over this problem. We are in favor of a political settlement of the question around Afghanistan. The more rapidly an agreement is reached, (?by such an) approach, the better for Afghanistan, for the neighbors of that country, and I understand when I am speaking about Afghanistan, that the problem of refugees is also a part of this question. But I cannot agree with you that the problem of refugees occurred because of the coming of Soviet troops at the invitation of Afghan Government into Afghanistan, which was a temporary measure. We are committed to a political settlement. We will continue to work actively for it, and we are inviting all sides, all those who have a bearing on this problem to cooperate. I would like to repeat once again the prospects of a settlement of this problem in the near future do exist. This is our assessment and will work on the basis of this assessment.

[Sharada Prasad] [words indistinct] Press Agency, the question to the prime minister.

[Reporter in Russian with simultaneous English translation] Mr prime minister, at present, a process is underway of active militarization of the Indina Ocean and it is interesting to note that there are no nuclear powers that are littoral to this ocean. All those nuclear arms were brought in by other countries. Soon there must be a conference, there will be a conference, on making a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean.

Ideally, what do you think its decision, its resolutions should be? Could we from here, from the shores of the Indian Ocean begin a movement toward a nuclear free world by the year 2000 -- a goal that is also in the Delhi Declaration?

[Gandhi] The Indian Ocean has already been declared a zone of peace by the United Nations. Unfortunately, the conference, which should have taken place, has not taken place yet and we feel that it is being blocked by certain nuclear weapon states that have a vested interest in blocking. We feel that the Indian Ocean must be a zone of peace, free from nuclear power rivalries and it should not be such that it puts pressures, especially military pressures, on the littoral and hinterland states. But the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace is only one part of the world. We must look for the whole world as a zone of peace.

[Sharada Prasa] From JAGRAN, Kanpur, Mr Chanturbhuj.

[Reporter in Hindi] This is Chaturbhuj Mishara from DAINIK JAGRAN, a Hindi newspaper from Uttar Pradesh. This question is for Comrade Gorbachev. Our friendship is such that there should be no room for any kind of mutual misunderstanding in it. We have made, and are still making, great efforts to improve relations with China, but still there is not hope that she will become our friend, and you too are improving your friendship with her. My question is: If again China attacks us, then what will be your attitude? Will you continue to remain as a silent judge like in 1962 between a brother and a friend or will you side with us?

[Gorbachev] I think that if we have an improvement in the overall relationship in the Asian region, and particularly among great powers and great nations -- and I mean above all here China, India, and the Soviet Union -- that will create a very different situation and I think, I am sure that your forecast will not come true. No one will have to take sides. The trend, I think, will be, and it is felt even today, will be for the normalization, for an improvement in relations in the Asian region, including relations among countries like ours, like the Soviet Union, India, China.

[Walter Rogers] Mr General Secretary, Walter Rogers, the American Broadcasting Company. As you know, the United States this week exceeded the limits of SALT II, the SALT II agreement, by arming additional B-52 bombers with air-launch cruise missiles. I'd like to know what your comments are on this please, what will the Soviet response be and what effect will this have on arms negotiations please?

[Gorbachev] Yes, I have heard this information, I saw it on the press but I don't know yet. I have not seen any official statements from the White House on this question. But if that were so, that decision indeed has been taken, then we believe that the step is contradictory to the overall, to the entire logic of the Reykjavik talks and to the statements even of the U.S. side after Reykjavik that the U.S. side remains committed to the negotiations to a search for disarmament. And at this time they are demonstrating contempt for this important treaty and also for the ABM Treaty and for the SALT II Treaty. We regard -- if this is done, if this decision is taken -- we regard this as a major mistake which will make it more difficult to search for the approaches for disarmament. But at the same time, this is incentive for all those who understand the need for disarmament, the need for nuclear disarmament for abolishing nuclear weapons. This is a stimulus to them. So we in the Soviet Union are right when we call on all nations to understand that today everyone should act together, everyone should declare its [as heard] position to the Government of the United States.

[Sharada Prasad] Mr Inderjit.

[Reporter] Mr General Secretary, I would like to address a question to you. The Soviet Union has proved to be a tried and trusted friend of India. Yet ironically, your intervention in Afghanistan has created for us the biggest problem in the last 5 or 7 years. It has given the United States a diabolic excuse to pump in military hardware into Pakistan. It has created a monstrous security problem for us. So I would like to ask you, would you like to share with us? How close are we to a political solution of Afghanistan, what are the hurdles, if any, from Pakistani side or others? May I also say that our Prime Minister described you yesterday as personifying innovation and boldness. Do you think your association or the association of a small nonaligned group would help in a speedy solution of the Afghanistan problem which is in India's very speedy and urgent interest? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] I think that everything that can be conducive to a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan deserves attention. And I must say that I have spoken this to your question, I answered your question many times over these days. I have spoken aout it today. I cannot add anything, but I take note of the concern that is expressed in your question.

[Question] (Hans Vegeskiy), German Television addresses a question to the general secretary. Mr General Secretary, apparently it was because of security that you couldn't see so much of India this time. Because of security your movements were even limited in Delhi. Now I am sure for these reasons you must have given some thought to present-day terrorism and its implications. Would you mind sharing these thoughts with us?

[Gorbachev] My movements here in Delhi were according to programs we developed. Our goal during this visit was to give as much time, as much scope as possible for negotiations, for exchanging views. We felt that this was very necessary, and this is what we did. I think that this was done very appropriately because we have seen our results of this visit. So this was the reason. Now, as for terrorism. Our fundamental approach is well known to the world. We are categorically against terrorism. This is a basic principle of our policy domestically and internationally. We are categorically against terrorism in any form -- and particularly when terrorism takes the form of state-sponsored terrorism.

[Question] Your excellency, Hussaini, DAILY JANG, Pakistan. If I am allowed to address you as comrade. Comrade Gorbachev, [words indistinct] my question has got three parts. Comrade Gorbachev, you have expressed the hope for an early settlement of the Afghanistan problem. Now may we know what is the basis of your hope? Is there any new proposal coming forward? Secondly, you have spoken about an Asia-Pacific security plan. I want to know how does Pakistan fit into it, and if so, in what way. Thirdly, what are your suggestions for improving an understanding between the Soviet Union and Pakistan, and what irritants do you think there are which have prevented the two from maintaining good-neighborly friendly relations? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] A couple of words to each of your questions. As for proposals about the conversion of the Indian Ocean into a zone of security here, our views are very similar to those of the Indian Government as expressed by the prime minister here. We are ready to take part in the process that will lead to the creation of a security environment here and this would be useful for all littoral states such as Pakistan and also in the interest of the entire community that is using the Indian Ocean for developing cooperation. You also asked about whether there is anything new about what makes me more optimistic about the settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. I think that there are indeed some new elements, many new elements.

So far as the Cordovez mission is concerned, there is movement emerging there, reciprocating movement, and so far as the understanding of the desire of other countries is concerned, including the Soviet Union, the desire of countries to see a settlement of the problem, I would maybe confine myself to this remark. Because, particularly it is a little awkward to discuss this subject very specifically here when there is a very concrete search underway for a solution. I would not want to impede that, to hamper that process. I think this process is underway.

And finally, the last aspect about our relations, the relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan. As you know, we have already cooperated with Pakistan. Even in difficult moments we did our bit in order to ease tensions in the region and we are prepared to continue to act in the same spirit. But we also hope that Pakistan too will reflect on its positions in the context of our common interests to see the situation in the region normalized.

[Question] Mr Ranjan Gupta. I have a brief question for the general secretary and our prime minister. Mr General Secretary, my question is again on China. You have been expressing hope that India and China can resolve differences. May I ask you how this can be done when China continues to sit on thousands of square miles of Indian territory, is aiding and assisting Pakistan to develop a bomb? Could you tell us what is your position on the disputed territory? Do you consider it Indian or Chinese territory? My question for our prime minister is, Mr Prime Minister, in Bangkok you had told your Thai counterpart that you would discuss the Kampuchean problem with Mr Gorbachev. Have you done it, sir, and with what results?

[Gandhi] We did talk about the Kampuchean problem. The basic problem is, and in this we have not changed our positions right from the beginning of the problem, that is that there can be no solution that involves anyone from the old Pol Pot regime. During my visits to Indonesia and Thailand, I thought that a similar view was also held by those countries. We have discussed this and perhaps it will require much longer discussions at a different level and we will try and continue that exercise.

[Gorbachev] I would also say that indeed the problem of Kampuchea was a subject for an exchange of views, for comment, for mutual analysis, and comparision of our opinions, and we decided to continue the discussion of this problem, the Kampuchean problem. We know how it developed, how it emerged, and it is ncessary to have a resolution of this problem in the interest of the people of Kampuchea who were so much victimized for very well-known reasons. As for the question about the border disputes between India and China, I think that both India and China have everything that enables them to sort out these disputes and find solutions that would on the basis of trust, on the basis of realities, on the basis of historical facts, that would resolve that problem. This is a problem that China and India will deal with.

[Question] Venkat Narayan. This question is addressed to Mr Gorbachev. Twenty years ago at Tashkent your country made efforts to bring India and Pakistan together. Your excellency, what are the changes of your playing a role in trying to bring India and China together? Did the Indian prime minister raise this question of your mediation in our talks with China or would you like to operate yourself to bring these two Asian giants together so that there can be qualitative improvement in the situation in this part of the world?

[Gorbachev] I believe that contacts between India and China do exist and those contacts will be used to clarify all the problems of mutual interest.

[Question] Richard Ehrlich -- TORONTO STAR. I believe in your answer to our Saudi colleague you mentioned that the more than 4 million Afghan refugees did not leave Afghanistan because of the Soviet presence in Afghanistan. I would like to know why they have left their homeland. Secondly, if the Afghan Mujahidin continue to fight and refuse a political settlement that you might agree to and refuse to recognize a government that you might feel is friendly toward Soviet Union, is then that the Soviet troops are essentially trapped in Afghanistan by the Mujahidin if they continue to fight?

[Gorbachev] Actually, the situation that obtains now in the world is such that if new and new nations [as heard] become increasingly more creative, independently creative, they make their own political and social choices, they choose their own paths. These facts, these phenomena are seen in many continents of our planet. What should our attitude be toward this? We believe that if we do not recognize the right for each people to make its own political and social choice, no normal political [word indistinct] in possible. It is all the people of a particular country that have the right to decide what role it will take, what its ideology will be and what forms of political organization it will use. This is its sovereign right. Incidentally, the majority of the states (?which you) represent here have taken this path beginning from the Soviet Union, India, the United States and to all the other countries. Then why have we recognized the rights of China, in some cases early and in other cases little later, like the United States has recognized the October Revolution only 16 years after it occurred, although we recognized the struggle of the American people and the results of the revolution and we supported it. We recognized the right of the Indian people to make its own choice when it proclaimed independence. And while the great powers, the other states should not deprive the others of this rights, this is the basic and overall prerequisite for understanding the issues to why conflicts arise -- they arise because some people are sometimes prevented from the implementation of this legitimate right.

As for Afghanistan, this is our neighboring state. Under all regimes we had excellent relations with this country. It is something up to the Afghan people to decide what regime, what system they will have in Afghanistan. We have cooperated with kings, we have cooperated with prime ministers, we are cooperating with the present day Afghanistan, the present day regime that was formed on the basis of revolutionary events that took place in that society. Do we have the right to deny the right to follow the example of others and make some choice and give emphasis to this society which lags behind in its development. I don't think we have a right to do that.

We went to Afghanistan, we introduced a limited contingent of troops at the invitation of the government which existed at that time and we will leave Afghanistan. We cannot accept or tolerate a situation in which our troops -- and no one can conceal the situation in which Soviet troops will remain in Afghanistan. [sentence as heard] We have trust in the friendly people of Afghanistan and troops appeared there were the independent choice of the Afghan people called it a question due to outside interference [sentence as heard]. We are in favor of an independent, nonaligned Afghanistan that disposes (?sovereignly all its) resources and all that belongs to Afghanistan. We are in favor of a neutral Afghanistan. And what the regime will be that will exist there -- all this is something up to the Afghan people to decide.

[Question] [Question in Russian with simultaneous English translation] TELEGRAPH AGENCY of the Soviet Union. I have a question to the prime minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi. Mr Prime Minister in his speech and [word indistinct] talks, Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev proposed that wide dialogue begin related to the issues of security measures in Asia and Pacific region.

What is the contribution that was made in the course of the Soviet-Indian negotiations in Delhi -- that have just concluded -- (?was made to this process), and Mr Prime Minister what is assessment of that contribution. Thank You.

[Gandhi] As I mentioned in one of my speeches the idea of an Asian cooperation for peace is not new. It was put forward by Pandit Nehru almost 40 years ago even before India became independent. I have always felt that for true peace we have to move our foreign relations -- not just ours as India but in the world -- up from the level of real politic or politicking to a meaningful relationship between countries which goes deeper when just present convenience or pragmatism. And this can only happen if there is enough understanding and exchange between countries. Asia is a good region to start with.

GORBACHEV MEETS WITH INDIAN PRESIDENT SINGH

LD261336 Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 26 Nov 86

[Text] New Delhi November 26 TASS -- TASS special correspondents report:

A meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President Zail Singh of India, took place here today.

When greeting the Soviet guest, the president stated that his country welcomed Mikhail Gorbachev as an outstanding leader of the great power with which India is brought together with the ties of close traditional friendship.

"At the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, you, Mr Gorbachev, did a great thing for the whole of mankind: a message of peace to all people on earth came from there," the president stated.

"In your words," Mikhail Gorbachev said, "I see the opinion not only of India but of many other countries and peoples. The nuclear threat, ecology, backwardness and poverty of whole continents -- all these realities call for a new thinking and a new approach, and call for an end to the arms race."

"The Soviet Union's policy in matters of war and peace has much in common with the policy of India. The USSR's and India's opinion is the point of view of one billion people. We are ready to continue to cooperate with India, taking into account the new requirements of our times. I am confident that the visit will make a new contribution to the development of Soviet-Indian relations."

GORBACHEV, DELEGATION DEPART DELHI 28 NOV

LD281017 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0901 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Commitee, left Delhi for Moscow today. He was in India at the invitation of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, on an official friendly visit.

On the route from his residence to the airport, accompanied by an escort of honor, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was greeted by hundreds of thousands of citizens of the Indian capital. At Palme airport the Soviet leader and his wife were seen on to the plane by Rajiv Gandhi and his wife.

Taking part in the seeing-off ceremony were members of the Indian Government, parliamentarians, prominent political and public figures, and representatives of business circles. Also among those seeing them off were Soviet Ambassador Rykov and Indian Ambassador to the USSR Kaul. The state flags of both countries were raised at the airport; a guard of honor from the three armed forces was drawn up on the tarmac; a band played the national anthems of the USSR and India. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev inspected the formation of Indian soldiers, airmen, and sailors. The commander of the guard of honor reported to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. After the ceremony the Soviet airliner set off for Moscow.

Departing together with Comrade Gorbachev were: Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs; Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Damentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Chernyayev, assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR and first deputy minister of defense of the USSR; and Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR.

OFFICIALS GREET GORBACHEV ON RETURN FROM INDIA

LD281448 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 28 Nov 86

[Excerpts] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, today returned to Moscow from New Delhi where he stayed on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Rajiv Gandhi the prime minister of India, and of the Indian government. [passage omitted on persons accompanying Gorbachev]

At Vnukovo Airport Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was met by members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Comrades Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov; candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Comrades Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Sokolov, Talyzin; secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrades Biryukova, Zimyanin, Medvedev, Tazumovskiy, Yakovlev, and other comrades.

Among those meeting them were the temporary charge d'affaires of the Republic of India to the USSR (Bhatnagan), and diplomatic employees of the Indian Embassy.

PRAVDA COMMENTS ON ALBANIAN DEVELOPMENT, POLICIES

PM011221 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

["Observer" ("Obozrevatel") article: "Albania's National Day"]

[Text] The last Hitlerite soldier was driven out of Albania on 29 November 1944. That date has gone down in Albania's history as a national holiday -- the day of the country's liberation from the fascist occupiers.

The Albanian people traveled a complex path to achieve that victory. Fascist Italy's Navy and Air Force attacked the Albanian ports of Durres, Vlore, and Sarande on 7 April 1939. The reactionary Zog regime which was in power at the time committed an act of national treason by refusing to resist and by abandoning the country.

But the Albanian people did not submit to the conquerors. Spontaneous resistance was launched against the aggressors, which later evolved into an organized antifascist struggle. A special role in the development and leadership of this struggle was played by the Albanian Communist Party [ACP] (today's AWP). From the moment of its formation in November 1941 the ACP headed all the progressive forces advocating struggle against the foreign conquerors. The communists marched in the front ranks of the fighters against fascism, setting examples of staunchness and courage. Gemal (Stafa), member of the ACP Central Committee and leader of Albania's Communist Youth Union, died heroically in a clash with gendarmes in Tirana on 5 May 1942. Communists (Perlyat Redzhepi), (Branko Kadiya), and (Yordan Misya) died in a battle against Italian carabineers in Shkoder on 22 June. But the fighters who died were replaced by tens and hundreds of new ones. The communists' example inspired patriots to step up the struggle against the occupiers.

Entire zones in the country had already been cleansed of fascist aggressors by the summer of 1942, and in September a national liberation front was formed on the ACP's initiative, rallying within its ranks broad strata of Albanian antifascists. The formation of regular army units was launched throughout the country. By July 1943 there were already 20 strike battalions and 30 partisan detachments operating in Albania, which liberated considerable parts of southern and central Albania's territory. The General Staff of the Albanian People's Liberation Army [APLA] was created on 10 July.

Fascist Italy's capitulation did not bring about Albania's liberation, because Hitlerite troops had been moved into the country back in July-August 1943. The young APLA gave a fitting reception to the new occupiers, offered stubborn resistance, managed to hold on to the country's liberated regions, and successfully repulsed the enemy's punitive operations in 1943-44.

By the fall of 1944 the territory liberated by the APLA had significantly expanded. By way of developing the slogan of creating a people's democratic government in an Albania liberated from fascism, proclaimed by the ACP at its very first organizational conference in November 1941, the villages and towns liberated from the enemy set up national liberation councils. Power in the liberated territories was concentrated in their hands, and they were called upon to defend the Albanian working people's interests under the new conditions, acting in accordance with the people's will.

The first antifascist national liberation congress was held in free Permet on 24 May 1944, and it laid the foundations of the Albanian people's democratic state. The question of people's power in Albania was essentially resolved at the congress, even though more than 18 months of struggle against foreign aggressors lay ahead.

Under the conditions of the Soviet forces' victorious offensive in the Balkans in the fall of 1944, the APLA, which had grown to 70,000 men by that time, completely liberated its country's territory. Some 28,000 of prewar Albania's 1 million inhabitants died in the struggle against fascism. The country emerged from the war in ruins and ashes.

Following the country's liberation, the ACP mobilized the people for the restoration of the war-torn economy and the socialist transformation of the motherland. The Albanian working people relied in this process on the solidarity and support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

During the years of people's power Albania has achieved major successes in its economic, social, and cultural development. The country, which was backward and semifeudal in the past, has created a diversified industry and developed agriculture.

Speaking at the Ninth AWP Congress, held 3-8 November this year, R. Alia, first secretary of the AWP Central Committee, noted in particular that the accomplishment of the main political, economic, and social tasks set by the previous congress marked an important stage along the path of socialist building in Albania. The guidelines for the new 5-year plan (1986-1990), which were approved by the congress, emphasize that the accelerated development of industry remains a paramount goal. The development of agriculture has been proclaimed to be a "problem of the whole society." Emphasis in social policy has been placed on enhancing the working people's prosperity. The congress pointed to the need for more skilled management of the national economy and emphasized the importance of developing the initiative and activeness of the masses, of strengthening discipline and order, and of making better use of the principle of material incentives.

In the foreign policy sphere the congress spoke out against the arms race, for the complete termination of nuclear tests and the dismantling and withdrawal of foreign missile bases from other countries' territory, and against the militarization of space. Emphasizing Albania's readiness to develop ties with foreign countries on generally recognized principles of international relations, the congress noted that peaceful coexistence is the only alternative for countries with different social systems. There was a positive appraisal of the growth of trade exchanges with socialist countries, and emphasis was placed on the desire for interstate relations with them to develop normally, on the basis of mutual advantage.

At the same time, the congress introduced no substantial changes of position on a number of other important international problems. This applies also to the approach to the question of an Albanian-Soviet settlement. It is well known that, since the early sixties, Albania's relations with the Soviet Union, just as with a number of socialist countries, have been broken [okazalis narushennymi]. It has to be noted that, in the past, elements of subjectivism and voluntarism were introduced into the process of overcoming the ideological differences that had developed. They were, unfortunately, extended to the sphere of interstate relations. Matters reached the point of breaking [narusheniye] diplomatic and other ties between the Soviet Union and Albania, whose equality and mutual advantage had been repeatedly noted by both sides until then.

More than a quarter of a century has passed since that time. Subjectivism and voluntarism have been condemned in our country. The Soviet Union resolutely advocates respect for the autonomy of parties and the independence and equality of states. It is against the practice of extending ideological differences to the sphere of interstate relations. And the fact that contacts between representatives of the USSR and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania have been altogether absent for many years in succession hardly serves the two countries' interests. This is unnatural for relations between states, and even more so when those states are socialist.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government firmly adhere to the line of normalization of relations with Albania. M.S. Gorbachev declared in his speech in Sofia in September 1984: "Our country is for the normalization of relations with the People's Socialist Republic of Albania. Given reciprocal good will, it would be possible to resolve this question in the interests of the peoples of both states and of the cause of peace and socialism."

The Soviet Union resolutely advocates the elimination of obstacles hindering the normalization of relations, the overcoming of all the acclumulated deposits [nasloyeniye] of the period of division [razobshchennost] between our countries, and a joint quest with Albania for ways to restore normal relations between the USSR and the People's Socialist Republic of Albania in the interests of our peoples and the cause of peace and socialism.

Greeting the Albanian people on their national day, Soviet people wish them new successes in socialist building.

IZVESTIYA REPORTS HONECKER-NIKONOV MEETING

PM011035 Moscow IZVESTIYA In Russian 28 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] Berlin, 27 Nov -- E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, received here V.P. Nikonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who is on a working visit to the GDR.

The friendly conversation centered primarily on how the CPSU and the SED could help to strengthen peace on earth by further strengthening socialism in the fraternal countries on the basis of the recent Moscow working meeting of the leaders of the fraternal parties from socialist CEMA countries.

Pointing out the highly significant results of his meetings with M.S. Gorbachev, E. Honecker stressed that the SED and the entire GDR people perceive the fraternal alliance with the CPSU and the USSR as a fundamental revolutionary gain and a most important guarantee for the GDR's further advance.

The SED considers that the policy of strengthening peace, disarmament, and averting the nuclear catastrophe, which is pursued by the CPSU and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is, as it was shown for the whole world to see in Reykejavik, a correct path to lasting peace. The SED supports this policy with all its energy and makes its own contribution to its implementation.

V.P. Nikonov spoke about progress in the implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions. He noted that the steady acceleration of society's socioeconomic development and the measures that have been taken to ensure it have led already in 1986 to greater dynamism of national economic development, including the sphere of the agro-industrial complex.

CLAIMS OF NERVE GAS SUPPLIED TO LIBYA DENIED

PM011551 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 4

[D. Pilyatskin "Rejoinder": "On Nervous Ground"]

[Text] The scandalous story involving covert weapon supplies to Iran has caused America's NATO partners to ask a number of questions. "The most difficult question to answer is how the U.S. allies, and Britain in particular, should react to this frightening spectacle of American stupidity, duplicity, and incompetence," Britain's SUNDAY TELEGRAPH asks.

How, indeed? Especially if your bear in mind that this whole outburst of righteous indignation can be directed at London itself. According to a report in that same newspaper, arms and ammunition have been regularly supplied from London to Tehran. This is where the SUNDAY TELEGRAPH rushes to the Thatcher government's aid.

Simon Russell, the newspaper's defense correspondent, stunned readers with a sensation recently. It turns out that Libya has received missile warheads "containing lethal nerve gas" from the Soviet Union. You need more? The man in the street is being frightened by talk that Syria has chemical weapons, too.

Proof? There is none, although that does not inconvenience Russell. He cites the CIA's "suspicion," which "has been confirmed in the last few weeks by the British intelligence services, who traced (?!) the source of the nerve agent back to the Soviet Union." And that is that.

This fabricated lie is so patent that it remained the exclusive monopoly of the SUNDAY TELEGRAPH -- no other respectable London newspaper repeated Russell's story. But Britain's airwaves were contaminated. This was the work of the BBC, which clearly decided that the patented "toxic nerve agent" would distract listeners from the somber thoughts about the U.S.-British "Irangate."

DEMOCRATIC YEMEN'S AL-'ATTAS CABLED ON REELECTION

LD241829 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 24 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS -- The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet sent a congratulatory telegramme to Haydar Abu Bakr al-'Attas on the occasion of his re-election to the post of chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council of the Democratic Republic if Yemen (PDRY).

In his reply telegramme Haydar Abu Bakr al-'Attas expressed gratitude for congratulations and good wishes addressed to the Yemeni people.

The telegrammes express confidence that all-round relations between the USSR and the PDRY will develop successfully in future too for the good of the two nations, in the interests of universal peace and social progress.

DEMICHEV, OTHERS ATTEND RSFSR CONFERENCE

LD012142 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] At a conference of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and of the RSFSR Council of Ministers the contribution that can be made by the local soviets to the process of restructuring which has taken in all spheres of our life was discussed. The conference examined the implementation by local soviet and economic bodies of the RSFSR of the tasks ensuring from the decision of the CPSU Central Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and of the USSR Council of Ministers on measures to further enhance the role and increase the responsibility of the soviets of people's deputies for speeding up socioeconomic development in the light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress.

In the report by Comrade Orlov, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and in the speeches it was noted that the local soviets have started to approach the tackling of many questions with greater responsibility. At the same time, as was stressed at the conference, many local soviet and economic bodies are giving up obsolete working methods with great difficulty. A few ministries and departments have not started implementing practical measures, have been playing a waiting game and are relying on additional instructions. A pressing task for the local soviets, as was stressed at the conference, remains the widening of publicity and the intensification of the struggle against bureacracy and red tape.

The conference was addressed by Comrade Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Taking part in the work of the conference were Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Comrade Razumovskiy, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, of the USSR Council of Ministers and of the AUCCTU.

REPORTAGE OF RSFSR SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

Opening Agenda

LD020841 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0740 GMT 2 Dec 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The fourth session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation opened in the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow today.

Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shevardnadze, Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Talyzin, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Zimyanin, Medvedev, Nokonov, Razumovskiy, Yakovlev and Kapitonov were greeted with applause by deputies and visitors.

The session was opened by Deputy Gribachev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

The agenda and the order of work for the session were confirmed unanimously.

The deputies have to examine the following questions:

On changes in the composition of the presidium of the republic supreme soviet;

On the state plan for the economic and social development of the republic and the budget for 1987;

On the work of the commissions on public health, social security, and sport;

And they will confirm the decrees of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

On the first item on the agenda the deputies unanimously elected Deputy (Mustayev) to be deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet presidium.

A report on the state plan for the economic and social development of the republic in 1987 and on progress in fulfilling the plan for 1986 given by deputy Maslennikov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's State planning committee.

The session is continuing its work.

Morning Session Speakers

LD021207 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Dec 86

[Text] A session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet began work in the Kremlin today. At the morning sitting a report on the State Plan of the economic and social development of the republic for 1987 and the progress of the fulfillment of the plan for this year was made by Deputy Maslennikov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers and, chairman of the State Planning Committee of the republic. A report on the State Budget of the RSFSR for next year and the implementation of the budget for 1985 was made by Deputy Bobrovnikov, minister of Finance of the Russian Federation.

Speeches were then made by Deputy Ovchinnikov, Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy Lomonsov, secretary of AUCCTU. A report on the plan and budget was made by Deputy Cherepanov, chairman of the Planning and Budget Commission of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

A debate on the reports then began. The speakers were: Deputy Korolev, secretary of Moscow Gorkom; Deputy (Umalatov), chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Daghestan ASSR; and Deputy Fadeyev, head of the Oktyabrskaya Railway in Leningrad.

An interval has now been declared at the session. The evening session will begin at 1600.

MOSCOW NOTES WORK ON RSFSR LEGAL CODE COMPLETED

LD011735 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 1 Dec 86

[Text] The preparation for the publication of a code of RSFSR laws has been completed.

A meeting took place today at the Commission for Legislative Proposals of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on the end of this work and on the progress of implementation of a list of acts which are subject to elaboration and inclusion in the code. It was noted that a significant amount of work has been done to develop and further improve republic legislation directed at continuing to improve the regulation of state, economic and sociocultural construction, and to strengthen the protection of society's interests, the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, and its administration in keeping with the USSR and RSFSR constitutions.

At the present time two out of five volumes of RSFSR codes of law have been published. The others will be published during this year and 1987. A large number of legislative acts envisaged in the list of acts which are subject to inclusion in the code have been elaborated and adopted. In the course of their preparation, the commission on publishing the code, the RSFSR Ministry of Justice and other ministries, state committees, departments, and scientific institutions did the necessary work to prepare new acts and fill lacunae in legislative regulations using less obsolete norms.

With the setting up of a code of laws for the RSFSR consistent legislation will be strengthened and the legal basis of socialists society consolidated.

SLYUNKOV GIVES REPORT AT BELORUSSIAN CP PLENUM

LD300304 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 29 Nov 86

[Text] Positive changes are taking place in the majority of labor collectives in Belorussiya. This is the conclusion made by the participants of a plenum of the Belorussiyan Communist Party Central Committee that took place today in Minsk.

The issue of restructuring the work of the primary party organizations of the republic and strenghtening their influence on accelerating the socioeconomic development of labor collectives in the light of the demands of the 27th CPSU Congress has also discussed. The report was delivered by Comrade Slyunkov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Belorussiyan Communist Party Central Committee. Those who spoke noted that a strengthening of the influence of party organizations would reflect on the dynamism of the development of the republic's economy. It was noted at the plenum that today, party organizations should direct labor collectives toward achieving maximum results, develop in people a modern way of thinking, and remove obstacles in the path of acceleration.

Taking part in the plenum was Comrade Igrunov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department.

SHCHERBITSKIY URGES 'WAR' AGAINST INCOMPETENCE

LD012254 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMt 1 Dec 86

[Text] The primary questions in the introduction of the State Acceptance Service were discussed today in Kiev at a conference of the party and economic aktiv of the Mechanical Engineering Complex of the Ukraine. Speaking at the conference, Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Republican Communist Party, noted that after the party's 27th Congress, attention to solving the tasks by radically increasing production quality in the Republic has been strengthened.

However, there has been no occurrence of a far-reaching reorganization in work to increase the technical level and quality of items. The proportion of output in the higher quality category has fallen. The 10 month plan was not fulfilled in this aspect. The main thing now is to declare a real war everywhere on the botchers. There is a wide field of activity here for the party committees, the management bodies, trade unions, and Komsomol organizations.

UKRAINIAN CP CC EXAMINES DRAFT PLAN, BUDGET

AU020947 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 25 Nov 86 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has examined the draft 1987 Ukrainian SSR state plan for economic and social development and the state budget.

In the adopted decision it was emphasized that the republic's draft plan and budget were in conformity with the directives of the 27th CPSU Congress and of the June 1986 CPSU Central Committee plenum. Their objective is not only to consolidate, but also to develop the positive changes and trends which have emerged recently. The rates and proportions have been envisaged in line with the targets of the 12th 5-Year Plan, and in many indexes even surpass them. Provisions have been made to raise production and its effectiveness on the basis of accelerating scientific-technological progress, of pursuing an active investment and structural policy, and of intensifying the policy of economy. The plan has been drafted with an eye to the entire industry and other national economic branches switching over to the new management conditions.

An important peculiar feature of the draft 1987 plan and budget consists in their increased social purposefulness. The envisaged volumes of the production of consumer goods, of consumer services rendered to the population, and of houses put into service surpass the 5-year targets.

The republic's 1987 budget, drafted in conformity with the draft state plan, has taken into account the need to concentrate financial resources on the main sectors of accelerating economic and social development.

Having for the most part approved the draft 1987 plan and budget, the Central Committee found it expedient to introduce into these documents some amplifications, and requested the Ukrainian Council of Ministers to submit them to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet for examination.

In connection with preparaton for the 70th anniversary of the Great Octover, the instruction has been given to widely enhance and to creatively utilize in labor collectives the accumulated experience and socialist competitions to meet the 1987 targets and to complete by 7 November th 2-Year plans for the 5-year period.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has approved a working plan for organizing in the republic the measures drawn up at the 14th November conference held in the CPSU Central Committe Committee headquarters in connection with the practice of state acceptance of products to be introduced at enterprises. [paragraph continues]

In particular, provisions have been made to examine the tasks stemming from the conference materials and from the speech delivered at the conference by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in party organizations at enterprises, as well as at branch conferences in the cities of Kiev, Dnepropetrovsk, Rovno, Severodonetsk, and Chernigov, and at ministerial and departmental board sessions, and to carry out a packet of organizational and technical measures in order to prepare enterprises and associations for switching over, as of 1 January 1987, to the practice of state acceptance of products.

Obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms, ministries, and departments have been requested to staff state acceptance organs with highly qualified cadres experienced in practical work, and to organize cadre training. Measures have also been drawn up to strengthen the material-technical base of technical control services at enterprises.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has obligated ministries, departments, and leaders of enterprises which are about to introduce state acceptance to take measures to improve the quality of products, to improve planning and designing, and to raise good organization, technological and production discipline, and everyone's responsibility for the final result.

YELTSIN ADDRESSES MOSCOW RESTRUCTURING SEMINAR

PM011015 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 86 p 1

[Sh. Muladzhanov report: "To Accelerate the Process of Restructuring"]

[Excerpt] A seminar of first secretaries of Moscow CPSU raykoms began its work yesterday. Its subject is "The First Steps in Restructuring. Practice, Experience, Problems." Secretaries and chiefs of sections of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom are taking part in its work.

B.N. Yeltsin, first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, addressed the seminar. [passage omitted]

FINNISH PAPER CITES YEVTUSHENKO ON CULTURE

PM011255 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 25 Nov 86 p 18

[Report and interview with Soviet poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko by Ben Hellman: "Yevtushenko Back on Many Fronts"]

[Text] The world of Soviet culture is seething with life at present. Bans on suppressed novels and movies are being lifted. Social criticism has become noticeably sharper than in the past. The terror of the Stalin years is again being mentioned. Within the artists' organizations people are calling for a democratization of decisionmaking processes. There is spring in the air.

One of the signs of the thaw is the fact that poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko has again stepped into the arena and made himself spokesman for the new winds. We remember him as the angry young man of the Khrushchev years. Then he sank into oblivion. As a poet he got caught in the old models. [paragraph continues]

As customary in the past, he praised the October Revolution and the Russian people, expressed compassion with the little people and the forgotten in society, proved his internationalism with scenes from exotic corners of the world. But his freshness was gone.

Yevtushenko also kept out of the way when the struggle for human rights, including authors' freedom of expression, became tougher under Brezhnev. While contemporaries like Vasiliy Aksenov were forced into exile, Yevtushenko bided his time.

Now Yevtushenko is making his comeback on many fronts. He is a novelist, movie director, photographer, debater. He is now in Finland to publicize his new book, "Fuku," which, in the author's own words, has been translated "sensationally quickly" into Finnish. In "Fuku," which is a cocktail of poetry and prose pieces, Yevtushenko is out to end taboos. However, the book deals mostly with taboos outside the Soviet Union, and when he mentions the infamous Stalin-era police chief Beria he is noticeably more cautious.

[Hellman] Is "Fuku" a work of the thaw?

[Yevtushenko] I could also have written such a work earlier, since I am here developing themes from my early poems. But it would have been difficult to publish it. Even now there were those who wanted to prevent publication. But I had the support of the journal's editorial staff and fellow writers. Today it is the writers and not the bureaucrats who solve such problems. People defend each other's rights to have divergent views and let history judge. The fact that our society has now begun to tolerate pluralism is for me a sign of maturity. [answer ends]

Yevtushenko spent a lot of time talking about the sensational events in the world of culture. He even wants to suggest that the Gorbachev thaw is without parallel even in the West as far as courage and freedom are concerned. But is there a risk that a new cold spell will destroy all this?

"Today a new Russian word has become a part of the international political language. It is 'glasnost,' which stands for free and open debate. It is not the Kremlin which has now ordered us to begin to write honestly. 'Glasnost' is not a gift from above or a candy with which the government is trying to bribe us. In actual fact it is the result of a long and stubborn struggle on the part of writers. When in the sixties I wrote my poems, 'Stalin's Heirs' and 'Babiy Yar,' it was not on orders. That was my generation's protest against a false philosophy. We were told not to dwell upon the dark sides of the past, not to rub salt into wounds that had not yet healed. But on the other hand we thought that it was even more dangerous to rub sugar in the wounds."

Now Yevtushenko praises the 27th Congress in the same words that he used in the fifties to praise the 20th Congress and Khrushchev's showdown with Stalinism. The enthusiasm is back.

"We are on the verge of a real rebirth of Soviet culture. What my generation once hoped for is now being turned into reality before our very eyes."